

THE C.S.G. SUMMER SCHOOL

MORE than once it has been proposed to hold a Catholic Summer School in England, similar to those which have achieved such popularity in France and other countries. At last the experiment has been made, and its success has been so complete that we may now safely regard the Summer School as one of our established institutions. It certainly has an important part to play in the Catholic life of the country. Some account, therefore, of the manner in which our first attempt was organized may prove useful to those who, at home or abroad, realize the importance of this form of adult education.

The Summer School held by the Catholic Social Guild took place at Oxford from Saturday, June 26th, till Monday, July 5th. It was attended by fifty students, most of them regular study-club members, working in various parts of the country under the direction of the Guild. They came from Preston, Sheffield, Bristol, Leadgate, Blackburn, Stockton, Hull, Gateshead, Wigan, London, and twenty-one other centres. Thirty of them came on "scholarships" awarded by the Guild as the result of an examination: that is to say, they had their travelling expenses, board, lodging, and fees paid by the Guild. This was only possible owing to a generous benefaction for the purpose made by one of our oldest members. The other twenty students paid all their own expenses. Of the ten women who attended the School two came on scholarships. Besides the fifty student visitors, a few resident Catholics attended the daily lectures and took part in the life of the School.

Very various were the occupations represented by the students. There were miners and shipyard men, postal workers, textile workers, railwaymen, engineers, clerks, and shopkeepers. There was a Labour Exchange manager and the manager of an industrial concern. Yet there was a marked similarity of type among the men. Nearly all were young men and nearly all were wage-earners actively connected with trade unions, co-operative societies, and Catholic organizations. Many were members of local authorities, taking a prominent part in the municipal affairs of their respective towns; all were serious social students, and in most cases, leading members of study clubs.

This was, decidedly, the right sort of crowd to get. It was

not a case of bringing together a faintly-interested collection of amiable people, attracted mainly by the prospect of a week's holiday in historic surroundings, and vaguely conscious that they *ought* to start finding out something about these questions discussed in the newspapers. Here, rather, was a gathering of picked men and women who had for years been up against pressing social problems, who had thought and read and discussed them among themselves time after time, who had at their fingers' ends the actual facts of the situation, and who wanted to correlate their knowledge on the firm basis of Catholic principles. But before describing the result of the Summer School upon them, let us sketch the programme of the six working days which they spent at Oxford.

There were two lectures each morning and one every afternoon. The first morning lecture (save for the opening lecture on the Monday) was given by Father Joseph Rickaby, S.J., and dealt with ethical principles. The nature of morality, law, conscience, authority, the State, and similar subjects, were expounded with that clearness and charm which mark Father Rickaby's lectures, and the result was a revelation to the men. As one of them said, they had never before seen things "hang together" like that.

The second morning lecture was given by Mr. F. F. Urquhart, Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College, whose syllabus was as follows:

- (i). "*Back to the Middle Ages.*" How mediæval civilization differs (a) from modern civilization, (b) from that of the late Roman Empire.
- (ii). *The Foundations.* The fall of the Roman Empire and the Barbarians. The elements of reconstruction. Primitive feudalism, the Church, the Empire.
- (iii). *The Mediæval System in its Fullest Development.* The twelfth and thirteenth centuries. A real Christendom: a real local life: a Christian civilization. The defects.
- (iv). *Town Life.* The first industrial system without slavery. The Guilds.
- (v). "*Liberty*" and "*Democracy*" in the Middle Ages. The hierarchical system: ranks and classes. Autonomous corporate life.
- (vi). *The Defeat of the Middle Ages.* The decline of the system. The sixteenth century Revolution.

After each of Mr. Urquhart's lectures there was a time for questions, which came thick and fast, and they were good questions. The men had been reading history with keen interest: and here, again, what they specially valued was the way in which the lecturer "brought things together," and gave them a broad, comprehensive sweep of the features and tendencies of that great period which evidently made such an appeal to them.

In the afternoons of the last four days of the week, essays were read to tutors. Father Rickaby and Mr. Urquhart took the men four at a time for an hour or so, and discussed their essays in detail. This was an extraordinarily useful exercise for the men, who took the utmost pains with their work and spent a great deal of time on it, in some cases rising at unearthly hours in the morning and in others, we suspect, burning midnight gas. This individual tuition is an indispensable feature of a Summer School. It means hard work for the tutors, and it means, too, that the number of students must be kept down. But personal attention given to a few is worth any amount of promiscuous spraying at a crowd in a lecture room.

The evening lectures (at 5.15) were given by Mr. Henry Somerville, and fitted in admirably with the ethics and history of the mornings. The men were now called upon to face modern practical questions such as Socialism, Capitalism, Nationalization, Co-operation, with a groundwork of ethics and a background of history. Here, again, the discussions which followed the lectures gave evidence not only of keen interest and much detailed knowledge, but of the power to apply Catholic principles and to make good use of the lessons of history.

As a kind of text-book for the whole course, much use was made of the twopenny pamphlet published by the Guild, and written by Father Husslein, entitled *A Catholic Social Platform*. We say, as a *kind* of text-book: for Father Husslein's concise summary covers a far wider field than could be explored in a week. It is, in fact, as many of our readers know, an able statement of the principles underlying Christian civilization and of the various reforms which call for our consideration. Some of the latter are not mere deductions from Catholic principles, but involve questions of policy about which Catholics are free to make up their own minds. Hence, while some of Father Husslein's propositions are, amongst all Catholics, necessarily to be accepted (though there is much

room for earnest study if we are to grasp and expound them tellingly), others are more controversial. Nevertheless, it is an immense help to the Catholic student, not only to have his principles set down clearly in a concise form, but to have before his eyes some attempt to apply them to the whole field of social life.

What is certain, is that the students now appreciate Father Husslein's *Platform* very much more than they did before they listened to the Guild lecturers expounding the ethical aspect of social problems, tracing that aspect through history and applying it to a few concrete problems of to-day. The *Platform* cannot profitably be skimmed through: its propositions open out enormous fields of study and great vistas of history. To have dealt with only a few of them, to have analysed and explained and illustrated and criticized them, may be considered a very good week's work.

What did these fifty students take away with them? Not merely a knowledge of particular facts hitherto unknown, but, above all, an increased power of dealing with facts, seeing their significance, checking them, grouping them. They learned, indeed, *how* to study. "We shall be able to go on for ourselves much better after this," many of them said. They now had some notion of a *method*. They would, henceforth, be on their guard against hasty generalization, "short cuts" of every kind, easy shibboleths, popular catch-words. They could now take the *Platform*, a part of which had been treated in the lectures and discussions, and handle the rest of it in the same fashion.

This sense of a new power growing within them,—a power of balancing evidence and seeing both sides and applying principles as well as of clearing away misunderstandings and avoiding ambiguities and expressing their thought clearly and tersely—was much stimulated by the informal talks from the Master of Balliol and Mr. Ernest Barker, of New College, to which the students listened with a kind of amazed delight. The procedure was simple. The students asked questions and put objections. These questions ranged over such topics as the ideals of labour, education, University training, wages and hours, the employment of women, the State, rights of parents, Guild Socialism, property, art. It was not merely that the Master of Balliol and Mr. Barker drew generously out of their great stores of knowledge: what was still more valuable was that they showed the students *how* these and similar topics should be handled. For two hours the Master

stood the bombardment in the Junior Common Room of his college: and even after that, it was some time before he could be extricated from the crowd of eager questioners that surrounded him in the quadrangle. "How *sane* he is" was the general comment. "We didn't know that Dons were like that."

Never was a crowd more thirsty for knowledge. They crowded round the Vice-Chancellor, who most kindly showed them over Trinity College, and they remembered all he had to say about the Durham monks who were connected with that great foundation. They took notes greedily at the lectures, and these they could be seen writing out diligently afterwards. Above all, they discussed social questions all day and every day. In the streets, in the College gardens and quadrangles, at their meals, in little groups and larger circles in Common Rooms, they debated and argued and illustrated and questioned.

Some of these gatherings were almost of a formal character. The whole fifty sat one evening on a lawn and, with incredible enthusiasm, concerted schemes for impressing Catholic social principles on the mind of the country. It was extraordinarily stimulating and encouraging. Most of them had never met one another before, they came from widely distant centres, they all knew something of the discouragements that beset the social student. Yet one after another rose to say how, in his own district, difficulties had been overcome and progress made: and how, unquestionably, thousands of men and women were turning to the Catholic Church for a solution of their difficulties. They themselves had persevered in their study clubs and their reading and their efforts to make themselves useful Catholic citizens: they had persevered, though their study hours could only be snatched at night after a long day's work in mine or factory or office; and now they found themselves in company with half-a-hundred others who shared their own hopes and aspirations and had battled with similar apathy and suspicion. There was an instant sense of brotherhood based on their common faith. What could they not do now that they were in touch with one another?

One of the priest-students present, himself from a great industrial centre, confessed frankly to that gathering that he had never in his life been so much impressed and encouraged as he had been that evening by the splendid faith and enthusiasm shown by the men. For the future he himself would be heart and soul in the cause for which they were

working so generously. This leads one to hope that to future Summer Schools the clergy may be encouraged to come in larger numbers. The men realize that without the priest they can do little: with his active encouragement they can do anything.

Several of the men, by the kindness of Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C., were housed at the Franciscan House of Studies: another dozen lived at Campion Hall: the rest were in twos and threes in adjacent lodging houses; several of the ladies stayed at the convents. Most of the students were at Holy Communion daily; and those who lived in the religious houses felt deeply the immense privilege (as several of them spontaneously said) "of living under the same roof as the Blessed Sacrament." Several times in the day they would slip into the chapel for a short visit, and when it was suggested that next year we might be able to occupy one of the colleges, the proposal did not meet with much favour because it seemed to involve not having the Blessed Sacrament with us.

It was this that marked off the Catholic Summer School from all the Summer Schools which it has been one's privilege to attend in the past: they, too, were pleasant, helpful, stimulating,—but they were not grouped round the Blessed Sacrament, and that made all the difference.

Very definite and practical results may be expected from this Summer School. In the first place, as has been said, the students have gone back to their various parishes with their minds broadened and full of a great hope. Already we hear of an increased impetus given to their study clubs, of their endeavours to form new clubs in their neighbourhood, of their systematic efforts to propagate Catholic social literature. Moreover, at the garden meeting above referred to, they made up their minds without any doubt that two things must be secured as soon as possible (and they considered, in much detail, the ways and means): the first was a monthly Catholic magazine dealing with social questions, the second was a Catholic Labour College at Oxford.

It may be thought, perhaps, that we are claiming too much for the Summer School. "Can any solid educational work be done in the course of a single week?" it may be asked. "Will a few days' cramming produce any lasting effect?"

Under ordinary circumstances, we admit, very little. But let it be again insisted upon that the Summer School in this case did not stand by itself. It must be regarded as the complement to the work of the study clubs. These study clubs have been meeting every week for years: many of the

men represented clubs that were started in the early days of the Guild. These men have worked patiently through the Guild text-books and much other reading that we have recommended to them: they have, in many cases, passed the C.S.G. examinations. For them a week of Summer School was more fruitful than a year in the economics course at Oxford would be to a beginner. Indeed, one very good judge declared that the level of the men who attended the Summer School was higher than that of those who have done a year, or even two, at Ruskin College.

The Guild is definitely training Catholic working class leaders. That is a work the importance of which it would be difficult to exaggerate: a work which has been commended to us again and again by the Holy Father. Upon its success the whole future of the Church and civilization may depend. The clergy have seen its importance, and in increasing numbers they are throwing their weight into the cause of the Guild. We have, in our Catholic workers, unrivalled material. We must do our best to help them and to give them such opportunities as will make them worthy exponents of that Catholic faith which alone can save the world from chaos.

One point may be added. The opening lecture of the Summer School, at the request of the members, was given by Father Lockington, S.J., on the subject of "The training of Public Speakers." No better exponent of the art of public speaking could have been found. Father Lockington, as is well known, has in Melbourne a most successful Catholic school for public speakers, and the men and women he has trained are becoming a very considerable power in Australia. Again and again our own study clubs have expressed their desire for training of this kind: and it is a satisfaction to know that Father Lockington has promised to write them a manual as soon as he reaches Australia.

A Summer School at Oxford will now, we may be sure, be an annual event. But it may also prove possible to organize occasional Summer Schools elsewhere: possibly in Lancashire or on Tyneside. Readers of the current C.S.G. Year Book will not need to be told of the enormous developments of adult education during the past few years, and of the important results that have followed it. In this matter Catholics should lead; and the success of their first Summer School proves that they can. We have solid ground beneath our feet, a background of tradition, and a message for which the world is waiting. And we have an enthusiasm which only needs to be kindled into a flame.

C. PLATER.

THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC CONGRESS

THE decision to hold an Anglo-Catholic Congress was arrived at in the early summer of 1918, at a meeting of clergy and laity at All Saints', Margaret Street. The resolution was at once adopted with enthusiasm by Anglo-Catholics throughout the country, and its execution in every way more than justified the anticipations that had been formed as to its success.

The "purpose and aim" of the Congress, as stated in all the programmes, was:

the extension of the knowledge of Catholic Faith and Practice at home and abroad, and by this means to bring men and women to a true realisation of our Lord Jesus Christ as their personal Saviour and King.

This quotation is taken from the *Official Handbook* of the Congress, published by Messrs. Mowbray (1s. net)—in every respect a model of what such handbooks should be. In addition to the authorized programme, it contains an interesting preface by the Rev. E. F. Russell,

the last survivor of the little group of men who, in the early days of St. Alban's, Holborn, fought and won the battle which has served in a measure as the foundation of the later successes of the Catholic movement.

Mr. Russell was present at the Congress, and the mention of his name, with that of the Rev. Arthur Tooth, announced as having been "imprisoned forty-three years ago in Horse-monger Lane jail for doing what was now done in St. Paul's Cathedral," was received with resounding cheers. Canon Ollard contributes a brief but interesting sketch of "The Marvellous Progress of the Catholic Revival: its Critics and some of its Lessons"; and the Rev. Marcus Atlay, chairman of the executive and moving spirit of the meetings, states the "Origin and Aims of the Congress." There are portraits and short biographies of the principal speakers, with notes and illustrations of the principal churches connected with the Congress: the latter perhaps give a better notion of present-day Anglicanism than mere description could do.

The principal purpose of the Congress was doubtless as stated: other aims, however, were in the minds of those who

drew up the programme: among them the following, which, in no way conflicting with the principal purpose, may be regarded as stating more definitely the details by which that purpose was to be carried out:

It is the aim of the Congress to demonstrate to the world that the Catholic position within the English Church is the real and true interpretation of what English religion is meant to be, and further, to make plain that English Catholics have no intention whatever of being driven either to Rome or into schism; but that they intend to claim, with no uncertain voice, their rightful heritage within the English Church.

The somewhat truculent tone of the last sentence perhaps somewhat justifies the "misconception" that the Congress "was an attempt to dictate to the bishops assembled for the Lambeth Conference," or, as the *English Churchman* puts it, of "frightening the bishops": such an intention is disavowed by the promoters, in whose minds, however,

it has of course been that it might be of useful interest for the bishops assembled at Lambeth to have before them the papers read;

the Bishop of London, too, who extended a verbal welcome to the gathering, wrote that it would be of "great assistance" to the Lambeth Conference "to have before them the considered opinions of the Congress." But if the *Record* (July 8th) is to be credited, the Bishop of Zanzibar disavowed the disclaimer by saying in his opening address: "You may believe that if you like"; and the *Record* is not alone in adding: "Frankly, we do not believe it."

The *English Churchman* suggested that the "irritated nerves and drooping spirits" of the "despondent ones among their own party" needed a "tonic." If such were the case, the remedy was successful: it would be impossible to imagine more enthusiastic gatherings than those which filled the Albert Hall, often literally to overflowing. The moderate anticipation of the promoters was indicated by the fact that the first place of meeting selected held only 1,200 people; in February of last year, the Queen's Hall, holding 2,500, was secured; within a month of that date the Albert Hall was taken: the membership of the Congress is stated as 14,000. Not less remarkable than its enthusiasm was the earnestness of the meeting; the eccentricities of dress and manner which were at one time noticeable in High Church gatherings found

no place. The standard of the papers read was worthy of the position of those who contributed them, and, incidentally, an answer to those who have taunted the Anglo-Catholic party as wanting in intellect; with one or more exceptions, they were of the right length and well delivered, although the acoustic defects of the hall sometimes rendered them inaudible. No discussion followed the papers, though this is distinctly indicated in the *Handbook*; in view of the differences of opinion, even in the most advanced circles, of which the *Church Times* weekly affords evidence, the decision to exclude this was probably a wise one. The hymn-singing, as is usual in Protestant gatherings, was a remarkable feature, and the selection of hymns¹ even more remarkable, not only on account of their literary standard, but for their doctrine—who could have expected to have heard some 13,000 Anglicans joining vociferously in a hymn sung to the tune usually assigned to "Daily, daily," whose refrain was "Hail Mary, hail Mary, hail Mary, full of grace"?² This refrain had so captured the popular mind that at the thanksgiving service at Southwark Cathedral on the Thursday night the service within was rendered almost inaudible by the singing of "Hail Mary" by the crowds who were unable to gain admission.

The programme, much of which was duplicated at evening meetings, was admirably chosen so as to embrace subjects of general interest and others more especially connected with the party represented by the Conference—all, of course, being regarded from the Anglo-Catholic standpoint. It opened with a declaration of "The Message of the Church" with regard to "the really great question of the day, *i.e.*, Modernism"—the essays on "Modern Criticism" and "Modern Speculation" were the only lay contributions to the Congress: they were by Prof. C. H. Turner, of Magdalen College, Oxford, and Prof. A. E. Taylor, of St. Andrew's University. The Bishop of Zululand, treating of "The Evangelization of the World," aroused great enthusiasm; in response to his appeal "for missions which would show to the world that Catholicism was not dead," the Rev. Marcus Atlay invited

¹ Some of these were taken by permission from *The Catholic Supplementary Hymn Book*, published by A. Moring in 1918 (1s. net), which contains many excellent hymns.

² When *The English Hymnal* appeared, exception was taken to this and to one or two other hymns in which Our Lady was prominent, and some of the bishops—the Bishop of London was one—insisted on certain alterations, among them the omission of this refrain. A slightly abridged edition was published in order to meet the objections, but I am assured that this is practically never used.

the Congress to send from the meetings "such an offering as would show the Lambeth Conference that Catholics were not indifferent to the cause of their foreign missions"—the insistence on the Catholic attitude will not be overlooked; at each meeting the appeal was renewed with such earnestness that the sum of £25,000 was raised, in money and jewels, before the close of the Congress. Under "Christian Unity" were discussed the relations of Anglo-Catholics towards "The Roman Catholic Church," "The Holy Orthodox Church of the East," and "Other Christian Bodies"; "Corporate Religion" included two Eucharistic papers, "The Sacrifice of the Altar" and "The Reserved Sacrament," with a paper on "The Faithful Departed," with reference to "Our Attitude towards Spiritism" and "The Saints and Angels"; under "Personal Religion" came Prayer, Communion, Meditation, Mysticism, Retreats, and the Religious Life. The final evening meeting; under the chairmanship of Bishop Gore, which dealt with "The Church and Social and Industrial Problems," seems to have been regarded as on a different plane from the rest: at this laymen found a place among the speakers, and the Bishop of London, whose absence from the Congress, which he had welcomed by letter, led to the expression in the *Church Times* of "a general feeling of sympathy with his Lordship in the disappointment which must be occasioned to him by his inability to welcome it in person"—"this," as Artemus Ward used to say, is evidently "writ sarkastik"—put in an appearance.

The absence of any attempt at a Protestant counter-manifesto was remarkable: his clients will surely expect some explanation from Mr. Kensit as to why no demonstration was made against the procession through the streets of twelve hundred clergy, vested in cassock, cotta, and biretta, preceded by a large crucifix and followed by about twenty bishops in cope and mitre,¹ each attended by two deacons; crucifix and thurifers—who, according to the *Star*, were carried by priests—going before them. Even outside the Albert Hall there was no wholesale distribution of Protestant tracts; one, *The Meaning of the Mass*, was being accepted by the unsuspicious, but on its nature being exposed by the present writer, steps were taken to prevent its further circulation.

¹ According to the *English Churchman* (July 1) "the Bishops were attired in some of the most gaudy confections in purple, blue, red, and green, ornamented with very glassy stones, apparently very new out of the theatrical costumier's wardrobe!"

To those who remember how, in the early days of the movement, the Book of Common Prayer was regarded as the standard by which teaching and practice should be measured, and to which all observances should conform, the attitude of the Conference was astonishing: it is exactly described by the phrase attributed to Father Stanton, who is reported to have thanked God that at St. Alban's they were "not prayer-booky." This was evident literally from the beginning, for the "Our Father" (without the doxology) was immediately followed by the "Hail Mary"—the first half being said by the Chairman of the Executive, the second by the whole assembly. To those who, with the writer, can remember the first prayer-book in which the formula—"May the Blessed Virgin," etc.—appeared, this public manifestation was one of the most remarkable events of the Congress: it may be assumed that the Society of the Angelus which recited only the first half of the "Hail Mary," has now fallen into line with that which used the fuller form. On the first morning, when the paper came to an end, about twelve o'clock, the presiding Bishop suggested that the Angelus should be recited silently; the audience *en masse* rose in response to his invitation.

The Conference was preceded by a series of "High Masses": the only reference to "Mass" in B.C.P. is in Art. XXXI. (which every Anglican priest has subscribed), where "the sacrifices of Masses"—there is no need to discuss the quibble by which it has been sought to differentiate the phrase from the Sacrifice of the Mass—are denounced as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." The whole trend and implication of the papers on the Eucharist was in direct contravention of Art. XXVIII., "Of the Lord's Supper," which ends with an explicit statement that

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped;¹

if my memory serves me, Bennett (in the Sheppard v. Bennett case, 1869), when confronted with this passage, justified his practice of "lifting up"—which it may safely be assumed is observed by most of the clergy attending the Congress—by saying that, although not part of "Christ's ordinance," the

¹ What the Elizabethan bishops who were largely concerned in the making of B.C.P. thought of the Mass is set forth in the catena of quotations from their works in Dom Norbert Birt's *Line of Cleavage under Elizabeth* (C.T.S.).

Church had ordained it since. The first announcement for the second day was "Requiem Masses for the Repose of the Souls of all English Catholics departed this life"—the phrasing seems to presuppose that even in the next world "*Ecclesia Anglicana*" will preserve its distinctness from East and West: what B.C.P. thinks of such Masses may be gathered from the Article already quoted, as well as from the entire absence from its pages of any indication that the dead are to be prayed for at all. Yet a careful statement of the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory, indistinguishable from "the Romish doctrine"—I am not unaware of the Anglican treatment of Art. XXII.—formed the main portion of Mr. Arnold Pinchard's paper on "The Faithful Departed." The attitude of the Congress towards "the Saints and Angels," on which Dr. Darwell Stone read a paper, has already been sufficiently indicated with regard to Our Lady; it is shown in the hymn to St. George,¹ which includes the significant verse:

Pray for us, Saint George our patron,
For thine England intercede,
Till from error purged, forgiven,
One in truth we chant our creed,
Till the Sacrifice she offers,
Catholic in word and deed.

The Article just quoted condemns such invocation as "a fond thing vainly invented," and it is hardly necessary to point out that no sort of invocation appears in B.C.P. The Books of Homilies, ordered by Art. XXXV. to be read in churches and stated to contain "a godly and wholesome doctrine," throw further light on B.C.P. teaching.

The main theme of the Rev. E. M. Milner-White's paper on "The Roman Catholic Church" was the essential unity of Rome and Canterbury in history, faith, worship, fruits, holy order, outlook and atmosphere. As the *Church Times* says, "it was an impressive catalogue," but the evidence adduced in support of the thesis could hardly be considered conclusive. He spoke of the desire for external unity, apparently overlooking the only too obvious fact that that "desire" manifests itself in two antagonistic directions: on the very eve of the Congress, Canon Barnes, in Westminster Abbey, expressed his regret that he could not ask "nonconformist

¹ The *cultus* of St. George has the approval of the Bishop of London, by whose permission the "Scouts' High Mass" at St. Cuthbert's, Philbeach Gardens, on August 1st, "will be a Votive Mass of St. George" (*Church Times*, July 16).

divines" to preach there. One welcomes the attitude which would emphasize points of agreement rather than of difference; but it is strange that Anglo-Catholics cannot realize that the "deep and fundamental unity—far more important than external unity"—which Mr. Milner-White claims as "already existing between Rome and Canterbury," presupposes a "fundamental unity" within Canterbury itself that is notoriously non-existent.

The paper on "The Reserved Sacrament," by the Rev. G. A. Michell, was of great interest, not only on general and historical grounds, but in view of the attitude towards reservation maintained until recently by the English hierarchy as a whole. The Archdeacon of Middlesex, in his Congress sermon at St. Augustine's, Kilburn, spoke of "the battle for reservation" which "had not only been fought but won"; and it may be worth while to summarize the principal incidents of the contest.¹

In May, 1900, the then Archbishops of Canterbury (Temple) and York (Maclagan) upheld the action of the bishops who had "forbidden [the] usage, which they regarded as contrary to the law of the Church of England"—Temple's words were: "I am obliged to decide that the Church of England does not at present allow reservation in any form": "the Archbishops declared that reservation for any purpose was not within the rules of the Church of England," and that "the rule was not to be regarded as relaxable in any other than quite extraordinary cases."² Five years later, the present Bishop of London, while "tolerating" reservation of the Sacrament for the sick (only), emphasized the precautions he had taken that it should not be used for any other purpose: he insisted that it should be "reserved in a chapel with locked gates," not in the body of the church, and that any case which admits of devotions to the reserved Sacrament or visits to it as part of the devotional life is outside the toleration," adding that he has "always been against" such visits for devotion or "for purposes of adoration."³ The Bishop of Rochester (now of Winchester) was even more emphatic,⁴ and, as far as

¹ In connection with the present attitude of Anglicans towards the Eucharist I may perhaps be permitted to refer to papers on "Anglicanism Sixty Years Ago" and "A Neglected Aspect of Continuity" in *The Dublin Review* for April, 1910, and January, 1914.

² Statement of present Archbishop of Canterbury before Ritual Commission: *Report*, ii. 336.

³ *Report*, Q. 20742, 20741, 20738.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Q. 18709—18716.

he could, stamped out the practice in his diocese: "I cannot approve and must forbid," he said to one clergyman, "the retention of the Sacrament in church—I mean in such parts of the interior as are open to and visited by the general congregation"; and in one case when it was, without his sanction, kept in a side chapel and it was reported that during a procession, the children genuflected before it, he said:

I had expressed a fear [this] would happen and plainly told [the incumbent it] ought not to happen. . . . I said, "If it is kept there and you will not take it away, you must desist from this procession which brings the children there. He said "No"—

and there the matter seems to have ended.

At the present time, reservation has become a recognized custom not only in England but in America, where the Bishop of Milwaukee said it was practised in most of the churches in his own diocese and in sixty or seventy others. It is rapidly extending, even in churches which cannot be regarded as "advanced"—*e.g.*, in Christ Church, Westminster, of which the Rev. R. J. Campbell is the incumbent: Catholic church furnishers are overwhelmed with orders for tabernacles. The attempt to restrict the use of the Sacrament for the communion of the sick was doomed to failure as soon as that practice was generally "tolerated"; and the public *cultus* naturally followed. Mr. Michell, in his paper, having shown that by the beginning of the third century, Reservation was "an established custom," and "historically on the same level with infant baptism," proceeded to say that

the primary purpose of Reservation was the communion of those absent from the celebration of the Eucharist. . . . It was easy to see how souls learned to seek the Tabernacle for purposes of private devotion; so naturally they passed to Exposition and Benediction—

a reference which was heartily applauded. Although further allusion to Benediction was tactfully avoided, it is matter of common knowledge that, although the service has to some extent been abandoned, in compliance with the personal request of the bishops, its place has been taken by "Adoration" or "Devotions"—a service which is practically Benediction without the blessing, the ciborium being exposed, the usual hymns (sometimes including the Litany of Loreto) sung, and incense offered. This service, if not actually "ordered

by lawful authority," in accordance with the rule which forbids additions to B.C.P. except when so authorized, is certainly known to some of the bishops and presumably "tolerated" by them. The *cultus* in "advanced" churches in no way differs from that of the Catholic Church; processions of the Sacrament are indeed condemned by the Bishop of London, but a visit to All Saints', Margaret Street, on Maundy Thursday—a church especially favoured by his lordship—left little doubt that the "liturgical service" announced on the notice-board had included such procession, and the beautiful "altar of repose," with its numerous worshippers, sufficiently indicated that it had taken place. Moreover, the practice of Communion out of Mass (and that in one kind), is by no means unknown in "advanced" churches. It may be noted that among the practices which the Report of the Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline (better known as the Ritual Commission) issued in 1906, said "should receive no toleration," and, if persisted in against episcopal direction, should be subjected to "coercive disciplinary action" in the Church Courts, are "The interpolation of prayers and ceremonies belonging to the Canon of the Mass," "Reservation of the Sacrament under circumstances which lead to its adoration," "Mass of the Præ-sanctified," "Benediction," "Hymns, prayers and devotions involving invocation of the Blessed Virgin Mary or the Saints." This Report was signed by the present Archbishop of Canterbury and two other bishops. The attitude of the clergy attending the Congress, and, indeed, of the Congress itself, is sufficient evidence that the Report has been treated with the contempt with which its institution was greeted: the *Church Times*, for example, said that of course the King could appoint a commission if he liked, but that no one would pay any attention to its decisions.

It is not wonderful that to Anglo-Catholics the success of the Congress, which it would be impossible to exaggerate, and the many fights "which have not only been fought but won," have proved a source of legitimate encouragement; yet there are certain aspects of the former that Anglicans can hardly overlook. Of this the attitude of the bishops may be taken as an example. The Bishop of Salisbury, indeed, preached the opening sermon, and that at a church where the fullest ritual was observed, but he did not walk in the procession; the Bishop of London, as has already been

said, appeared at the last evening meeting, and, with the Bishop of Chelmsford, took tea and strawberries in Gray's Inn; the Bishop of St. Alban's, lately transferred from Pretoria, preached at a concluding service of thanksgiving: but, so far as the Congress proper was concerned, no bishop of an Anglican see put in an appearance—a significant indication of the way in which they regarded the proceedings. American bishops and colonials there were in plenty, and the Congress had the Bishop of London's assurance that he would, at a safe distance, "follow [the] deliberations with the greatest interest"; but can anyone imagine that a Catholic Congress, from which not only the Bishop of the diocese, but the whole hierarchy absented themselves? A writer in the *Record* puts the matter neatly:

The English Episcopate boycotted the Congress in the most marked manner—indeed, save for missionary bishops it might have been a Presbyterian gathering.

The attitude of the Congress, not only towards the bishops, but towards the Establishment of which they are officials, was equally pronounced and definitely expressed. Thus the Rev. Leighton Pullan, in his paper on "Authority and Discipline," having referred to "the second half of the nineteenth century, when in every diocese the Bishop was a Pope," continued—I quote from the *Church Times*:

In recent times English bishops had enjoyed a unique degree of liberty. How far had they as a body acted as the guardians of the Sacraments and the authority of the Church? Were they seriously restraining the persistent attacks made by "libertine scribblers" upon the truth of the New Testament? Blasphemy concerning the Bible, Resurrection and Person of our Lord had been treated by our bishops more tenderly than Benediction.

Mr. Pullan's remarks have been called exaggerated; but surely those who remember the circumstances attending the consecration of Dr. Henson to Hereford, his reception by his brother bishops, and the pamphlets which followed, must hold them justified.

Of the Establishment, equally strong things were said—indeed, it has been remarked that the word "Anglican" was replaced by "Catholic" throughout. In his opening address, the Bishop of Zanzibar, according to the *Church Times*, said:

The Church in England is in bondage to the State; establish-

ment fogs the whole atmosphere: we who are here do not believe in the theory of a State Church at all;

according to the *Record*:

One unofficial speaker was applauded for two whole minutes for the striking phrase: "Not a National Assembly [the first meeting of the National Church Assembly synchronized with the Congress] but Disestablishment is what the Church wants".

Similar extracts might easily be multiplied, but these sufficiently show the spirit of the Congress. It is noteworthy that the Bishop of Zanzibar's reference to "the Holy Father" was heartily cheered.

Many other points suggest themselves for comment did space allow: notably what the *Church Times* calls "the central point" of the Rev. G. H. Clayton's paper in the "Christian Unity" section, in which he expressed his willingness to submit to conditional ordination "if by so doing he could help to heal the wounds in the Body of Christ," and suggested that this might be received "at the hands of prelates of the Orthodox Church of the East." The suggestion, which was "received with loud cheers," is likely, if rumour speaks truly, to be brought forward at the Lambeth Conference, at which Orthodox ecclesiastics, sent from Constantinople at the suggestion of the Archbishop of Canterbury, will confer with a committee, of which Bishop Gore is chairman, to consider Anglican relations with the East.

It would be easy, in conclusion, to dwell upon the obvious fact, of which every Anglican must be painfully conscious, that however great their advance in the Catholic direction, and however manifest their success, they are in full communion with those whose views they must regard as heretical, but who have equal claim with themselves to represent the Church of England. I would, however, rather repeat reflections that, written ten years ago, express the feelings that must, I think, inspire all Catholics who have the interest of religion at heart, and which the Anglo-Catholic Congress serves to intensify:

What may be the ultimate result of a movement which seems to possess so many manifest marks of Divine favour it is impossible to foresee. But in the steady advance of Catholic teaching, in the gradual breaking down of barriers, the removal of misunderstandings, the growth and development of the idea of reunion; in the willingness to consider and the anxiety to

understand such matters as the position of the Holy See; and in what is, perhaps, the most hopeful of all—the recognition of the position of the Blessed Virgin in the Christian scheme and the power of her intercession—in these indications, some of them limited at present but steadily increasing, we may surely see ground for faith, material for hope, and, above all, the need of charity.¹

JAMES BRITTEN.

¹ *Dublin Review*, April, 1910, p. 370.

THE PIETÀ

I.

WHEN God from me withholds all sign,
When my stript soul lies spent and sped,
I turn from rood and lighted shrine,
And seek—Our Lady with her Dead.

II.

There, in a dim nook of the aisle,
She sits, dishevelled, sick with grief;
Eyes without light, lips without smile,
And beauty like a withered leaf!

III.

It seems that from that corner dim,
For comfort or for help she's cried
Long . . . yet is still alone with Him
Who now is death personified.

IV.

Upon her knees His lifeless Head
Sinks, as without the will to stir.
For all the burning tears she's shed,
He seems to heed nor tears nor her!

.

V.

"Such winter holds no seed of spring!
Such ruin has in life no part!
Her heart seems robbed of everything
That once she treasured in her heart!"

VI.

To her dumb pain I speak my pain,
From her dumb pain she speaks to me—
"God turned to me His Face again;
And so again He'll turn to thee!"

G. M. HORT.

WHY NOT A CATHOLIC ANTHOLOGY?

WHEN preparing for the press a small book on poetry, the present writer ascertained the fact, which already he had more than suspected, that there exists no recent anthology¹ of English poetry by Catholic writers or on Catholic subjects. The fact is certainly surprising in these days when anthologies of well-nigh every conceivable variety are being published in ever-increasing numbers. One would have thought that the ingenuity of publishers and inventors was already exhausted, and that to find a new pretext for an anthology would demand a rare inventiveness. All kinds of subjects have been anthologized—religion, death, love, the seasons, flowers, gardens, birds, dogs, babies, the sea, music, travelling, sports and pastimes. There are anthologies of the sonnet, the madrigal, the elegy, the ballad: Elizabethan and Jacobean and Victorian and Georgian anthologies. The anthologists have catered for children and grown-ups, for students and for the man in the street. Local patriotism has its anthologies. Yet nobody, in recent times at all events, seems to have thought it worth while to make a Catholic anthology.

There have no doubt been anthologies edited by Catholics. As far back as 1860 Aubrey de Vere brought out *Selections from the Poets*, in which the most is made of Catholic poets. In the 'nineties appeared Mrs. Meynell's exceptionally choice selection, *The Flower of the Mind*; Father Kingston, C.S.Sp., edited a selection for young folk entitled *The Ideal Poetry Book*.² Much more recently Rev. Prof. Geo. O'Neill, S.J., published his anthology for students, *Five Centuries of English Poetry* (1912), and there is Miss Kate M. Warren's *Treasury of English Literature* (1906), which devotes to pre-Reformation literature nearly 300 of its 1,000 pages. But these are general anthologies, and, though valuable to us in at least a negative way, have

¹ For convenience' sake I use this somewhat clumsy but generic term in preference to "selections," "choice extracts," etc.

² From time to time school Readers and Reciters specially suited for Catholic children have been published.

not that special value which I shall claim for a Catholic anthology. They are not Catholic anthologies in the sense in which M. Vallery Radot's excellent *Anthologie de la poésie Catholique* is a Catholic anthology. It is possible that at this point an incredulous reader may hasten to consult some catalogue of recent books. If he does so, he can scarcely fail to find figuring there a book with the title, *A Catholic Anthology*, and of quite recent date, too,—1915. I would ask him to consult the book itself. If he does so, his triumph will be short-lived. It will probably give way to a sense of mystification as to the connection between the title and the contents of this publication. He will find poems by Ezra Pound, W. Carlos Williams, W. B. Yeats, T. S. Eliot, etc. No doubt, in the editor's mind, the title stands for the wide and comprehensive scope of his selections.

But why is there no Catholic anthology in our present sense of the word? Can it be that materials are lacking for such an anthology? For the fear of haunting our poetic poverty might well hold back would-be anthologists. Here opinions will differ: but to the present writer, at all events, the materials seem to be abundant and of excellent quality. It is true we cannot draw upon any of the very greatest. Shakespeare,¹ Spencer, Milton, Wordsworth, Tennyson, were not of us. Nor yet Shelley, Keats, Byron, Scott, Browning, etc. The output of the post-Reformation remnant of the Catholic Church in England can bear no comparison with English literature as a whole from Shakespeare to our own days. Such comparison would be unfair in every way. Eschewing, therefore, all comparisons, let us take a rapid glance at the sources that might be drawn upon. For the moment we are considering, not so much poetry written in the Catholic spirit and tradition, as the work of poets who were Catholics.

There is first, of course, the whole of pre-Reformation English poetry.² This mass of literature is of the greatest importance, I need hardly say, to students of English literature. Much of it is of high literary value. Leaving aside

¹ Though indeed, as Newman said in his *University Discourses*, "there surely is a call on us for thankfulness that the most illustrious among English writers has so little of a Protestant about him that Catholics have been able, without extravagance, to claim him as their own, and that enemies to our creed have allowed that he is only not a Catholic, because, and as far as, his times forbade it."

² See E. Hickey, *Our Catholic Heritage in English Literature of Pre-Conquest Day* (Sands) 1910.

Anglo-Saxon and Norman-French poets, it includes at least one great poet, Chaucer. But even Chaucer wrote in a language which, though it is English, the modern reader has first to learn. Accordingly, in the present connection, we may lay less stress upon this period of English literature. Many, it is true, will be prepared to include modernized versions of Chaucer such as are to be found scattered through the works of modern English poets. In Wordsworth's works, for example, will be found modernizations of *The Prioress's Tale*, of *The Cuckoo* and *The Nightingale*, and of *Troilus* and *Cressida*, in which, as he tells us, "no further deviation from the original has been made than was necessary for the fluent reading and instant understanding of the Author." Others may prefer to print the original as it stands and to help the reader by notes and glossary.

The period from the Reformation to the first quarter of the nineteenth century was the long winter of the Catholic Church in England. During all those years there prevailed an atmosphere in which even the hardiest plants of Catholic literature could scarcely flourish, much less the delicate flowers of poetry. Yet even here something worthy of our anthology might be culled. The first Catholic poet of note after England's change of religion, Father Robert Southwell, S.J., was a contemporary of Shakespeare.¹ There is no doubt as to the high value of his work. "It takes rank," says an unbiassed authority,² "with the most touching examples of sacred poetry." In the reign of Charles I. flourished three Catholic poets, William Habington, Sir William D'Avenant, and Richard Crashaw. The first of these may be classed as a minor poet, yet has left us some devotional verse not unworthy of remembrance. The second is chiefly remembered as a prolific dramatist and as the author of *Gondibert*, an interminable poem in twenty cantos. Of the last-named, a convert near the close of his short life, but long a Catholic at heart, the same authority writes: "Crashaw's poems breathe a passionate fervour of devotion, which finds its outlet in imagery seldom surpassed in our language." Prof. Saintsbury³ lavishes praise upon this poet's work, and it has now fully come into its own. The magnificent Hymn to St.

¹ Henry Constable, another Catholic Elizabethan, wrote several poems worthy to figure in a Catholic anthology, notably his poems entitled "Holy Trinity" and "Saints Peter and Paul."

² Sir Sidney Lee in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

³ *Elizabethan Literature*.

Theresa, for instance, finds a place in the *Oxford Book of English Verse*. The only Catholic poets of the period between the death of Crashaw and 1830 are Dryden, the poet of the Restoration, and Pope, who sums up in himself the literary spirit of the eighteenth century. Great as is the position these two poets hold in English literature, they can give us but little for our anthology. Dryden was a Catholic only for the last seventeen years of his life. It is true that in those years he wrote *The Hind and the Panther*, which is an argument for the Catholic Church, and some of his best-known odes. Pope, who lived and died a Catholic, has left us, in the immense mass of his writings, scarcely anything that we could count as distinctively Catholic. The times were unpropitious. With the Emancipation of 1829, incomplete as it was, a new period opened for the Church in England, and consequently for Catholic literature. Four years later, in 1833 (it is Newman's date), began the Oxford Movement, and we owe the first noteworthy Catholic poetry of the century to the men of that movement, in particular to Father Frederick William Faber and to Cardinal Newman. Most of the former's work, which was considerable, appeared before his conversion,¹ but many of his beautiful hymns are Catholic. The greater part of Cardinal Newman's, on the contrary, dates from his Catholic period. It is unnecessary to commend the poetry of the author of "The Dream of Gerontius" and "Lead Kindly Light." Two years after the conversion of Newman and Faber, Edward Caswall, and five years after that event, T. E. Bridgett, afterwards a Redemptorist, followed in their footsteps. The former, after his conversion, published three volumes of sacred verse. Many of his hymns are still universally sung. Besides a volume of his own poems, which appeared in 1896, Father Bridgett published, under the title *Lyra Hieratica*, a collection of poems on the priesthood. Though Adelaide Anne Proctor wrote verse from her childhood, the bulk of it dates from after her reception into the Church, which took place in 1849, when she was twenty-four. Her well-known *Legends and Lyrics* were published in the 'fifties, and have enjoyed wonderful popularity ever since. With Coventry Patmore there came into the Church a poet whose reputation was already established. Tennyson, Browning, Ruskin, Carlyle, had spoken in praise

¹ When in 1842, three years before his conversion, Faber accepted the rectory of Elton, Huntingdonshire, Wordsworth wrote to him, "I do not say you are wrong but England loses a poet."

of *The Angel in the House*. But more was to come. And in *The Unknown Eros and Other Odes* the Catholic anthologist will find many gems for his collection. Three other convert poets¹ have left us notable work—Lionel Johnson, of whom Mr. W. B. Yeats has said that in his poetry he "completed the trinity of the spiritual virtues by adding Stoicism to Ecstasy and Asceticism," the late Mgr. R. H. Benson, and Father Gerard Hopkins, S.J. The strangely original work of the last-named will be familiar to readers of *THE MONTH*.² In the work of Francis Thompson we have the work of a Catholic born. And Francis Thompson is a great poet.³

As to living poets, Mrs. Meynell and Mr. Hilare Belloc have long been recognized as ranking among the foremost writers of the day. Among other Catholics who have published distinguished verse we may perhaps name Theodore Maynard, Prof. J. S. Phillimore, Lord Alfred Douglas, Father H. E. G. Rope, Maurice Baring, Wilfrid and Viola Meynell, Eric Shepherd, Mrs. Armel O'Connor, E. Nesbit.

Opinions will, no doubt, differ as to whether such an anthology as is here suggested should include poems from the literatures of other English-speaking countries, the United States, Ireland, Scotland, the British Dominions. To do so would be to widen immensely the field of choice. Scotland, for instance, has a great pre-Reformation literature in the works of such writers as Barbour, Henryson, Dunbar, and Gawain Douglas. America has produced no small number of Catholic poets, from Father Abraham Ryan to Joyce Kilmer, to say nothing of living writers. Ireland, though for long centuries Catholic literature was made well-nigh impossible by the same causes which were at work in England, and by other causes also, has, especially in these latter years, produced much Catholic poetry. True Ireland's deepest religious feelings and thoughts, when they found expression

¹ Perhaps we should add poor Ernest Dowson, for among his works are to be found poems of truly Catholic inspiration, such as *The Carthusians*, *The Nuns of the Perpetual Adoration*.

² Only quite recently, however, have his poems been collected—by the Poet Laureate, Mr. Robert Bridges. An appreciative study of his work will be found in *Studies in Poetry* by Rev. Prof. G. O'Neill, S.J.

³ This is, perhaps, the moment to refer the reader to some charming studies of Catholic poets (Southwell, Habington, Crashaw, de Vere, Hopkins, Patmore, Johnson, Thompson, and Alice Meynell) brought together under the title *The Poet's Chantry*, by Katherine Brégy (Herbert and Daniel) 1912, with Bibliographies.

at all, found their sincerest expression in Gaelic. Moreover, some of our best national poets in English, Davis, Ferguson, Allingham, "AE," Yeats, have been non-Catholics. Yet, when these allowances are made, there remains an output of Catholic poetry which is considerable in quantity, and often in value. I must content myself with little better than a bare enumeration of names. Few of them, I should think, are known outside of Ireland. Moore, whatever his faults, lived and died a Catholic.¹ He somewhat atoned for his youthful Anacreontic Odes by the *Sacred Songs* of his later years. Here and there among the numerous poems of Richard Dalton Williams, T. Darcy McGee, and Denis Florence McCarthy (the translator of Calderon), will be found poems of deep religious feeling and of no small poetic value. Naturally the greater part of the work of these poets of the nation is devoted to patriotic themes. The same is true of the work of the Fenian poets, Ellen O'Leary, J. K. Casey, and others, as of later nationalist poets, T. D. Sullivan, J. F. O'Donnell, and R. D. Joyce. Something might surely be culled from J. J. Callanan, Gerald Griffin, Clarence Mangan, and Francis A. Fahy, who are less exclusively national, or, as some may prefer to say, political.

The works of Aubrey de Vere furnish admirable material for a Catholic anthology. Then there is Canon Sheehan's *Cithara Mea* and the beautiful, if not wholly mature, poetry of "Ethna Carbery's" *The Four Winds of Erin*, and the religious verse of Father Matthew Russell. There is the work of the poets who were with us but yesterday—Dora Sigerson Shorter, Thomas Macdonagh, and Joseph Plunkett. And there is the work of not a few who are with us yet—Lady Gilbert (Rosa Mulholland), Katharine Tynan, Emily Hickey, Dr. Sigerson, Shane Leslie, Hugh McCartan, Count Plunkett, Philip Little, Brian O'Higgins, W. A. Byrne, and many who have not yet collected their poems into book form. I have hinted that as to the advisability of including in the suggested anthology the work of these Irish poets opinions may differ. If the writer may venture an opinion he would submit that, on the whole, this Anglo-Irish poetry would ill consort with the other contents of the book, and that the commingling would result in mutual loss. But that is merely a personal view.

¹ A Catholic, but I fear we cannot say a practising Catholic. But the evidence recently brought forward in the pages of *America* seems sufficient to clear him from the charge of having regularly attended Protestant worship during the last years of his life.

At all events we may fairly say, I think, that, with or without the help of other English-speaking countries, there is abundant material for a Catholic anthology. I would go further and suggest that there is material for at least three Catholic anthologies, and that each of these three would in its own way supply a want. In the first place, a selection might be made of the best poetry written by Catholics, the choice being determined, not by subject-matter, but by literary excellence. This, with a companion volume of prose, would serve to exemplify Catholic achievement in the domain of letters. On the advantages of this I shall not enlarge. A second anthology would consist of a selection of poems Catholic in subject, that is dealing either with some religious or semi-religious subject that is specifically Catholic, or dealing with some Christian subject in a Catholic spirit or in the Catholic tradition. The bulk of the material in such an anthology would, no doubt, be drawn from the writings of Catholics, but may not fit material be sought elsewhere? Time and again, as was indeed inevitable, poets not of the faith have struck a Catholic note which rings true, have sung of things Catholic in a Catholic spirit. Yet, in the main, Newman's description of English literature as a Protestant literature cannot well be gainsaid. "English Literature will ever *have been* Protestant."¹ Wordsworth's exquisite sonnet to Our Lady rises to the mind,² and many other such tributes may be found in such collections as Orby Shipley's *Carmina Mariana* and Mr. E. Hermitage Day's *In Our Lady's Praise*.³ One thinks of Longfellow, too, and Dante Gabriel Rossetti, and that strange genius, Robert Stephen Hawker.⁴ There are excellent non-Catholic religious anthologies from which much may be learned, for example, *Prayers from the Poets*, edited by Cecil Headlam and Laurie Magnus, and more recently, *The Mystical Poets of the English Church*, edited by Percy H. Osmond, 1919. Finally, I would suggest an annotated selection for schools. I think it is not an exaggeration to say that, so far as class-books are concerned, it is quite possible for boys and girls to leave school without suspecting

¹ *Lectures and Essays on University Subjects, III. Catholic Literature in the English Tongue.* §3, no. 3, end.

² The first thirty-nine of Wordsworth's "Ecclesiastical Sonnets" deal with Catholic themes in a not unsympathetic spirit.

³ With Preface by Lord Halifax (Pitman) 1912.

⁴ The parson-poet of Morwenstow who on his death-bed, was received into the Church.

that Catholics have had any hand in English literature. And that, I suggest, is regrettable.

The advantages of such anthologies, as are here suggested, are the advantages of all anthologies,—the concentration in a small space of poems of a special type or quality which else must be sought for through many volumes of inferior or, at all events, disparate matter, and the opportunity thus afforded of comparison and of a *coup d'œil d'ensemble*. A good anthology has something of the advantage of a well-arranged collection of old plate or of gems as compared with the shop of a dealer in antiques.

On the other hand, certain objections may very possibly suggest themselves. I have tried to meet the objection of lack of material. Other fairly obvious objections occur to one's mind. It may be thought, for instance, that our purpose is sufficiently met by existing anthologies, many of which, it must be acknowledged, show no special inclination to exclude Catholic writers. *The Oxford Book of English Mystical Verse* has been particularly liberal in its choice, no less than fifteen Catholic poets being represented in it. On the other hand, it would seem as if the immense abundance of the material available for a general, or even for a religious, anthology must needs result in the amount of Catholic poetry included being *relatively* small. And however generous the compiler may be in giving due recognition to Catholic poets—he will seldom, be it said, recognize them *as* Catholic—is his choice from their work likely to be such as would wholly commend itself to Catholics?

Another objection goes deeper. Poetry, it may be said, is independent of creeds; it is above controversy, and the clash of rival theologies; it lives and moves in a realm of ideal truth transcending sect and party; it is for man as man. To deal thoroughly with such an objection would call for more space than is at my command. A thorough answer, indeed, is the less necessary because the objection could scarcely come but from one outside the household of faith. Poetry is, after all, the emotional and imaginative presentment of truth, truth, that is, as the poet conceives it. For the Catholic poet the presence of Christ in the Eucharist is, not opinion or view, but simple truth. May not this truth be conceived emotionally and imaginatively and set forth in beautiful form? And as with the Eucharist so it is with the Priesthood—which exists for the Eucharist—so with our

view of Our Lady, of sainthood, of the Church, and of the other truths (as we hold them to be) abandoned by those who have abandoned the Church. But even as regards those truths which other Christians hold in common with ourselves, there is a Catholic way of looking at them, a Catholic spirit of dealing with them. They appeal to the imagination and the emotions of Catholics in a way different from their appeal to those outside. It is so with great events of the past; it is so, in a measure, with life in general.

If there be truth in this contention, it is not merely an answer to the suggested objection, it is, I think, the most valid plea that can be made for the existence of a Catholic Anthology.

STEPHEN J. BROWN, S.J.

POSTSCRIPT.—For such readers as may care to judge for themselves the distinctive tone and religious outlook of the Catholic poet, let me suggest a brief list, by no means fully representative, and for the most part supplementary to what has been already indicated.

The Religious Poems of Crashaw (Catholic Library). *The Poems of Francis Thompson*, and in particular "The Hound of Heaven." *The Religious Poems of Lionel Johnson* (edited by Wilfrid Meynell, 1916). *The Flower of Peace*, a collection of the devotional poetry of Katharine Tynan (1914). *Ballads and Verses of the Spiritual Life*, by E. Nesbit. *Poems of Adoration*, by Michael Field. *Folly and Other Poems*, by Theodore Maynard. A Catholic Anthology of Our Lady such as Orby Shipley's *Carmina Mariana*, or the more recent collection by Anita Bartle, *The Madonna of the Poets*, 1906. Purposely I have mentioned poets who, with one exception, are of English birth. Irish religious poetry is a world by itself.

TOLERANCE

ONE of the many delusions of the last age was that of tolerance. It was believed and vociferously repeated that bigotry, like torture and witchcraft, belonged to the dead past, buried beyond recall, that the virtue of tolerance, hitherto confined to chosen souls, had been for the first time and for evermore established among mankind. It was, in brief, one form of the general delusion of absolute progress, and "freedom slowly broadening down."

The truly thoughtful were not deluded, but they were indeed *rari . . . nantes in gurgite vasto*. Writing to a convert on November 29, 1900, the late Father Wilberforce, himself a convert, says:

You are right—everything can easily be forgiven except giving up all and joining the one true Catholic and Apostolic Church. Nothing else would matter. You might believe what you like, but if you leave the Establishment, that is the one unpardonable sin. The Jews never forgave St. Paul.¹

Sometimes, indeed, this bigotry oddly overreaches itself. The same letter tells us:

When first the Priory Church [Malvern] was built, the then Rector began a sermon, I am told, by the words: "Satan hath built a synagogue in my parish." The sermon sent two ladies of his parish to look at the "synagogue," and they both became Catholics and one of them a nun.²

As the late Monsignor Benson shrewdly put it, the average British family will hear with equanimity of its members becoming Quakers or Buddhists or even atheists, but should any of them think of becoming Catholics, henceforward the two thieves are the only fit companions for them!

Is not this exactly the "tolerance" which St. Leo satirized fifteen centuries ago?

"Haec autem civitas (Pagan Rome) ignorans suae protectionis auctorem, cum pene omnibus dominaretur gentibus, omnium gentium serviebat erroribus: et magnam sibi videbatur suscepisse religionem, quia nullum respuebat errorem."³

¹ In J. M. Capes' *Life and Letters* (1906), p. 273.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 272-3.

³ "For this State blind to the source of its real advance, after overcoming nearly every nation, became slave to the errors of every nation: and thought itself exceedingly religious because it rejected no form of falsehood." St. Leo the Great (Concio in Natali Apostol. Petri et Pauli) in Hurter *SS. Patrum Opuscula*, XIV, p. 36.

The very toleration that Locke paraded! "All the enemies of Rome are friends" *pro tanto*. Nor is this intolerance likely to remain only private.

And the forces which in Gregory's time¹ fought against this freedom [of conscience] are fighting against it in our own time. In Germany, a new Protestant Cæsarism has essayed the part of jailer of human souls to its Catholic subjects; while in France, Jacobinism, which is identical in its *ethos* with Cæsarism—the tyrant being legion instead of one, and clad in blouse instead of in imperial purple—is labouring, with all the fanaticism of militant atheism, to overthrow and destroy the rights of the spiritual side of man's nature.²

Modern tolerance means in effect that all views of life have free passage *except the true one*, which claims the allegiance of all men and all their activities in the name of God. But now, outside the Church, in art as in other and greater things, "Truth, with John Ruskin, has no defenders."³ Even the enemies of religion increasingly perceive what former generations knew, that "religion's all or nothing," that Catholicism is not a Sunday religion, but pervades the whole of human life as the blood circulates in every vein, and cannot with sanity be regarded as a *Privatsache*, as an individual whim.

Frederick Schlegel remarks (*Philos. Lang.* 7):

. . . in a good and right sense we may say that a work is a system, or that it is systematic, in allusion to its internal connection, and to the uniform and living unity which pervades it throughout. Now in this latter sense, every work which is written in the spirit of Catholicism must be a system; that is, it must embrace the whole truth. However broken and imperfect its arrangement, though it be but a rhapsody, it must still be systematic, in this noble and just sense of the term; and, in fact, it is nothing but this Catholic view of things, conceived in its highest degree of clearness, which Dante describes in that unrivalled passage, which is near the close of the Paradise.⁴

The world will always tolerate what it does not fear, and the relative insignificance of the Catholic body in England is the secret of the immunity which we still precariously enjoy. Those who trust in the permanence of such indifference are

¹ Gregory VII.

² W. S. Lilly in *Contemporary Review*, August, 1882, p. 261.

³ *The Catholic Review*, October, 1913.

⁴ Digby, *Mores Cath.* I. i. 16.

living in a fool's paradise, from which they will be rudely and soon awakened.

Only in the Catholic Church, whom her enemies forever charge with persecution, will be found a tolerance that is not indifference. As for indifference it should be enough to point out that for a true Christian it is impossible. If God exists and has claims upon our obedience (and how can these propositions be separated?) it is clear madness to attempt neutrality or the attitude of Gallio to the least of His commands or revelations. But the Church alone upholds in practice genuine freedom of conscience.

As St. Jerome says, "Heretics, not alone make for themselves idols of errors, but also adore, from their hearts, what they have made." Without pertinacity, therefore, as Wadding observes, no one is ever proclaimed a heretic; and this was expressly declared by Honorius III. in the cause of the Abbot Joachim, when he wrote to certain prelates charging them to punish those who should thenceforth call Joachim a heretic, on account of his book against Peter Lombard having been condemned by the general Council of Lateran.¹

Deep and genuine convictions are incompatible with the indifference that hides itself under the name of tolerance. Respecting all genuine freedom of conscience, the true Catholic strives by every lawful means to combat the false idea by prayer, example, and the testimony of the spoken and written word:

Just when Newman, however, was at the zenith of his power, . . . when his hopes were highest for the future of the Church of England, it dawned upon him for the first time that he was engaged in a useless struggle, that by parentage, by flesh and blood, and rearing, the Church of England was herself Liberal.²

There is, moreover, another aspect of the theory of tolerance. If often means in reality treason to our Holy Faith.

" 'Tis altered now;—for Adam's eldest born
Has trained our practice in a selfish rule;
Each stands alone, Christ's bonds asunder torn,
Each has his private thought, selects his school,
Conceals his creed, and lives in closest tie
Of fellowship with those who count it blasphemy." ³

¹ Wadding, *Annal. Minorum*, tom. V. VI., quoted by K. H. Digby, *Mores Cath.* (1846), Vol. II. p. 603.

² THE MONTH, February, 1908, p. 172.

³ Newman's Poems (Sacred Treasury Ed.), p. 195.

Far wholesomer was the old anti-Catholic bigotry that rested upon living though misguided conviction. Energetic error is potential zeal for the truth, indifference is death. Writing in 1855, "George Eliot" wrote:

It is only exceptionally that he speaks of them [Catholics] as fellow-men, acted on by the same desires, fears, and hopes as himself; his *rule* is to hold them up to his hearers as foredoomed instruments of Satan, and vessels of wrath.¹

This, after all, is logical enough. The Catholic Church is more than natural, and if not from God, then from the powers of evil, in no case insignificant.

M. de Tocqueville has said truly: "To subdue self is the secret of strength." First to subdue and then to devote one's self was the foundation of the Monastic institution; but it was also in civil and public life the foundation of the noble characters as well as the solid institutions and robust liberties of our Catholic ancestors.

When we have long contemplated and studied them thoroughly, we fall back with sad astonishment upon the tame and feeble temperaments, the failing hearts, the weakened character and enervated will of which modern society is formed, and which would make us despair of the future had not God made hope a virtue and a duty.

I do not know that vice has not been more flagrant, intense, and universal in other times, than the present; but I do know, unless history is a vast falsehood from beginning to end, that virtue has never been so enervated and so timid. I speak especially of public life. At the present time, and in public life, and the social sphere, virtue seems only to exist in men's consciences long enough to be sacrificed at the first appearance of danger, or touch of fatigue. If a struggle is inevitable, we may endure it for the space of a morning, but only on condition of being crowned with victory before nightfall, or capitulating next day.

Success only is esteemed, the vile success of an hour, of a moment, that inspires the most worthy souls with involuntary respect. Resistance, long and thorough, appears to them insane and impossible. We no longer know either the secrets of courage, the holy joys of sacrifice, or the magic of danger nobly encountered in a noble cause. Thus the reign of the infidel is less assured than that of the coward. Alas! it is our own weakness which is our worst enemy; it is this which makes the good man not only the involuntary slave but the docile servant, instrument, and accomplice of the wicked. Of all the arts, that

¹ *Essays* (1884), p. 179.

one which has been brought to the greatest perfection among us is the art of laying down our arms and stooping our neck under the yoke. We live in the age of concessions, of failures, of base complaisance for everything that has the appearance of strength. Fear is our Queen.¹

The Anglican Establishment being, as no Catholic can deny, purely human in origin and character, cannot rise above its source. In the words of Frederick Lucas:

Never let us forget that the Establishment at this present moment reflects the character of the English nation, and in both one may discern the same characteristics. Is the nation honest? No! Neither is the Establishment. Does the nation prefer principle to plunder? No! Neither does the Establishment. Does the nation mind how many hecatombs of lives are sacrificed to earn conquests for her abroad, how many oaths are violated to buy her Party successes at home? No! As the nation does, so does the Establishment.²

No satirist could wish an ampler theme than the catch-words which the army of news-readers blindly accepts and repeats, decade after decade, amounting in sum to that "conspiracy against the truth" which de Maistre saw in post-Reformation "history." Do these readers either know or care that Magna Charta has been in effect repealed? Indeed:

having once set up a fetish, John Bull, being a thoroughly religious man, cannot be induced by argument or reason to abandon a household god once firmly established in his national Walhalla. Probably your average Briton knows less about the "Glorious Reformation," Petition of Right, Magna Charta, the "Glorious Revolution," and British Constitution and Free Trade, and their import, scope, and effects, than an average parrot at the Zoo. Their sanctity in his eyes is mainly derived from their incomprehensibility, which conveys a fine confused feeling analogous to that experienced by the old woman who did not understand much of the sermon, but derived great consolation from that beautiful word, "Mesopotamia."³

To think clearly requires effort and steadiness, to imbibe printed falsehood and sophistry, to be dazzled by "the moving shadow-shapes" of the films, requires none. And well the manufacturers of "public opinion" know this, and steadily

¹ Montalembert quoted in J. Sweetman, *Liberty* (1910), pp. 17, 18.

² In *Life* (1885), I. p. 100.

³ *The Englishman*, March 3, 1909.

they are pursuing an end that is remote as the poles from modern "tolerance." The peril is further increased by the fact that the unnatural strain of unnatural industrialism produces by reaction an unnatural impatience of thought, an unnatural craving for *mere* sensation, *mere* excitement. Of this, too, the hidden powers behind the ephemeral politicians make their profitable account.

Among the wealthier classes self-indulgence has much the same effect as exhaustion among the victims of the machine.

The English religion has done this for the English people, that it has stripped Christianity of one-half of its divine elements, and has filled up the gap with human rubbish. Intellectually this religion is perhaps the greatest fallacy which has ever beset the human reason. It cannot be said to have mastered the human reason—it can only be said to have beset it—for no one ever intellectually believed in a theory which is palpably and transparently absurd. Still, it suits the modern mind; which is all for self-indulgence and for the repudiation of obedience and humility. This age is the least enlightened of any age of the world; because, speaking of God as "The Unknowable," it neither strives nor desires to know Him.¹

Now that "the smugness of agnosticism," the abysmal self-satisfaction that culminated in the Great Exhibition of 1851, the Victorian self-worship, are fading into a far-off memory, it is worth while to glance once more at their utterances. Discussing the very limited censorship at Rome in 1846-7, the authors of *Pius IX.* (1847) thus deliver themselves:

These arguments, however ingenious, will not satisfy the only censorship which, happily, exists in this country—public opinion—that great tribunal, against whose voice it were worse than folly, more pitiable than insanity—for it would indeed be criminal to contend. The *vox populi* never errs, but for the moment; excesses of every nature are repressed by the only power which is capable of subduing them—public opinion; there is no important interest in the empire whose stake is not trebly secured by the irrepressible independence of the Press; no Government whose severity or security could be maintained but by the virtue of public opinion; no laws whose enactments could be carried out but through the agency of the same imperial power, for the Press is the empire of a monarchy, as it is the death and destruction of despotism. In the exercise of its sovereign power,

¹ A. Marshall, *The English Religion. Letters addressed to an Irish Gentleman* (Dublin, 1876), p. 59.

the journals of a free press may do occasional injustice, which they will repair; they may injure individuals for the benefit of society in general; they may bring down the exaggerated pride of literary presumption; they may drive the struggler for fame into the new-river, parliamentary pretenders into insignificance, agitators into oblivion, the Statesman to suicide, and the Government to a dissolution, but the concentrated aim of the British Press is liberty, order, virtue, religion, loyalty, the rights of persons and property, with the crowning qualities of charity, mercy and humanity, and he who is indifferent to its anathemas, which are the excommunication of public opinion, merits no place but the dungeons of a lunatic asylum (*sic*) and no consideration but contempt.¹

Was a more foolish page ever printed? *Si argumentum quæris, circumspice.*

Modern tolerance against the literary world is much like the famous "freedom of contract" of the Manchester School. The workman is free to refuse the offered wages—if he likes to starve! The author or artist is free—if he does not happen to be living in Ireland or to frighten Madame D.O.R.A.—to write or shape what he pleases, but he must be content to remain unpublished if his work is not calculated to "succeed."

The nation can hardly be said to have preserved anything so natural and wholesome as ballads—it prefers the music-hall nastiness of "It's a long way to Tipperary," and the like—but those who actually rather than ostensibly rule over us, ask nothing more *at present*, than the power to make (by linotype) "public opinion." There is no need, *at present*, for open persecution. The boycott of unpopular truths is far more serviceable, *at present*. But he must be blind, indeed, who does not see the elements of persecution ready for the kindling torch, who imagines that in Ireland it is merely the national claim that attracts so much hatred, or that in England either, the family, the home, the Catholic school, are going to be preserved without a struggle that may become desperate. And he who attacks the family, the home, and Catholic education, is committed to warfare against the Church.

H. E. G. ROPE.

¹ Count C. A. de Goddes de Liancourt and James A. Manning, *Pius IX.* (1848), Vol. II, ch. xi. pp. 280—282.

A PROBLEM OF RECONSTRUCTION

VERSIN LE PETIT is a tiny village, quite as small as its name suggests. There, in the old times, the times before the war, Père Andrieux, the Curé, ministered to some few hundred souls, farmers and labourers. Then came a day when Mons. le Curé was called to the colours, and most of his male parishioners with him, and presently the tide of war reached the village and flowed over it. And its life as a village stopped.

When at last that tide receded, and, in due course, Mons. le Curé came back from the army, he found a parish indeed awaiting him, but neither village nor church, strictly speaking. Sundry ridges, just perceptible in the disordered soil, represented the one, and four walls surrounding a rubbish heap the other.

To house the inhabitants, as they crept back, was necessarily the first consideration. Some cellars still remained available, sheds were put up; by degrees it was managed, after a fashion. Then a tin roof was set up over part of the church. One hardly knew how it was done—one and another helped. Mons. le Curé's own hands were not idle. At last there was a corner where one could gather together a little congregation for Mass. That was something. A glimmer of the old peaceful ordered life of the little community seemed to revive in that. Père Andrieux drew breath more freely.

For the first home-coming—to ruins . . . had been terrible, do you see, quite terrible. Of course one had been looking at "devastated territory," all through the weary days of the war, at rubble-heaps that stood for villages, and ends of tumbled-down walls that represented churches. But the sharpest realization of what it all meant could not but come, when one said to oneself: "This is certainly where the village was. Jules Poteau's house should have been here. Here is surely where Mère Trouchon sold syrups. Was this the corner where the sacristan's cottage stood? One should know it by the chestnut-tree at the corner, but not even a tree-stump is there." That was the really ghastly thing, to stand on ground that was intimately familiar, to the last stone of it, and only to recognize well-known spots by inference and conjecture.

It was the same inside the church. Mons. le Curé clambered about the heaped-up ground, finding now a morsel of plaster, now a scrap of carving, here the head or hand of a statue, near that, a discoloured mouldy lump that had once been a cushion. It was sad work. The new roofing covered the altar, but it did little more. The congregation had to kneel mostly under the sky, in all weathers, and every devout old woman in the parish was *enrhumée*, chronically so. Père Andrieux had always particularly hated to hear coughing in church. Now his nerves were set on edge by it every morning, and his devout meditations thereby distracted. It was a small matter truly, when so much else was wrong, and he rebuked himself for being so unduly sensitive and irritable (like the throats of his congregation), but sometimes it seemed to be the last straw.

Newly-made ruins are depressing things at best, and perhaps they never look so unpleasant as when the weather is fine. It was one of the first days of summer when Mons. le Curé found the remains of the big Calvary, that used to stand in the south aisle. The crucifix had, it seemed, been buried under soft rubble of sand and crumbling plaster, and was not much damaged, though the Figure was separated from the Cross. With his soutane tucked up out of his way, Mons. le Curé handled his mattock and shovel delicately, and pushed away the looser part of the rubbish till he could draw out the beams of the Cross. One long nail still held it together, and he set it in position, propped it against the nearest wall, and then drew out the Figure and laid it against the wood. Our Lady should not be far off. Mons. le Curé went to work again when he had wiped his brow. The sun was wonderfully hot, and a bad bout of trench fever early in the war had given his health a shake. He was not quite the man he used to be, he reflected ruefully, even as his church was not the church it used to be either.

It took time and patience, this work. One must go very gently for fear the sharp-edged tools should do damage. There, at last, was a scrap of coloured plaster showing through the sand. He worked carefully for a minute or two more, and uncovered the whole image. Battered, chipped, armless, but the wan, down-drooped face under the mourning hood had escaped harm, and so had the length of the figure, with its straight lines of drapery. Mons. le Curé hoisted it up with an effort, and set the image of the Mother beside that of the

Son, both under the Cross, that hung all awry and drooped its loosened limb over their heads.

Finding them so comparatively whole had given him a feeling almost approaching to triumph, and he set them up eagerly. Now he stood and looked at them, propped against the tottering wall, with the heaped-up rubbish and litter coming to their very feet. The cruel sunshine poured down and showed every bruise and chip and crack. One saw how much they really were damaged. As he looked, a profound depression came down upon their discoverer. He saw, in the ruined shrine, a symbol of what the war had left in its train. The very attempt to restore order only seemed to bring to light the desolation and hopelessness. Mons. le Curé's heart sank.

So engrossed was he that he never noticed a passing automobile. Just beyond the church it pulled up, and after some consultation with the driver, a lady in black got out of it, and came towards the priest she had seen in the distance. She stepped with some difficulty over the rubbish heaps, and when she was close beside Mons. le Curé she asked him, in hesitating, uncertain French, the way to a neighbouring village. He turned with a start. Yes,—he could direct her, without doubt, but Madame must not expect to see a *village*, not like *this*, and he pointed to the irregular row of sheds and lean-tos that stretched away to one side. No reconstruction there, only one *knew* that a half kilometre beyond the rising ground to the south, as the road turns, there had been a village. Madame looked at *this* village, and then back at Mons. le Curé, shovel in hand, setting his reconstructed church in order, and her eyes filled.

"I am English," she explained; "I saw my son's grave this morning, and I wished to see also the spot where he fell. I think I can find it now. Thank you, mon Père." She lingered still, looking at the Cross and the statues, where Mons. le Curé had set them up.

"You have begun to rebuild your church?" she said.

"Something, as Madame sees, has been done . . . but . . ." Mons. le Curé spread out his hands with that expressive little gesture that Madame had seen very often in her two days on French soil.

"You have just dug these out of the ruins?" She pointed to the image of the other sorrowing Mother and her Son.

"It is true," Mons. le Curé asserted. "But as Madame

comes, I ask myself why? There is no room under the roof, where every inch is wanted for the people who come to Mass. I have only exposed them to the weather."

Madame's lips quivered, and Mons. le Curé felt self-reproachful for having been gloomy.

"But then we are fortunate here. We have made a beginning, and the rest will come when the good God wills. And for the moment, perhaps, I can find some planks there, where the gallery was, to make a little shelter. Gros Michon, the carpenter, will perhaps help me some evening. And for the rest, if there is no room for Him within. . . . They are used to that, both of them. Is it not so, Madame?" And he smiled at her.

"Will you give me your name and address. I might perhaps be able to send something—to help a little."

Mons. le Curé complied, willingly, though without letting his expectations be unduly raised. Madame had a sweet face, but his experience of people who plan to send subscriptions—"later on" had not been encouraging. After all, one never knows. Suppose she sent enough to get the Calvary re-erected? Mons. le Curé shook his head at himself. In this work-a-day world such golden visions partook of the nature of folly. It was better to remind oneself of tangible mercies, of the arrival, for instance, of the cattle, restored from Germany. Had they not been driven, lowing, along the track where the village street used to be only yesterday, and delivered to the respective claimants. That meant so much to the little community. Milk and butter in immediate prospect, and beyond that, some sort of chance of normal life and possible employment for the village. Yes, it was better to be thankful for that than to speculate on chances.

Mons. le Curé could never clearly remember how long it was from that day till *the* letter arrived. Some weeks it must have been; time enough to have forgotten all about the English lady and her pitying questions. It was a wonderful morning when he came back from Mass to find that letter waiting for him. La Mère Trouchon, with whom he lodged now, since the Presbytère was but a memory, had laid it on the little table where his bread and coffee were set out.

Mère Trouchon had a cellar, no less, an intact cellar, and so was one of the fortunate ones, and able to house Mons. le Curé: but since a cellar, even the most commodious, is a trifle dark and close, she always, weather permitting, set her guest's

breakfast table in the open. Two tumbled-down walls made a sheltered angle, and she had found a scrap of green trellis and had trained over it a plant of *canariensis*, which had managed to find nourishment and to sprout on stones and mortar, and was even preparing to flower. As things go, nowadays, in that part of the world, Mère Trouchon felt that she had successfully made an arbour. There Mons. le Curé breakfasted, on fine mornings, and there, on this particular morning, he found a letter on his plate. He believed he knew what it contained. Church furnishing firms were always showering advertisements upon him and soliciting orders, making his mouth water with all kinds of unattainable glories of shrines and altars and images. Mons. le Curé pushed it to one side while he munched his lump of rather sour bread and drank his coffee. It was black, and he reflected with satisfaction that now the cows were come one might hope for some milk presently. There was only enough for the children now, but after a bit . . . And then he opened the letter.

To be really and truly surprised is not a very common experience, especially when the surprise is a pleasant one. As a rule coming events cast some kind of shadow before them. But Mons. le Curé *was* surprised now. With hands that trembled, he smoothed out the letter before him, among the crumbs of his roll, and read it over several times, afraid to trust to his own eyes. Yet it was plain enough. If he had nearly forgotten the English lady, she, it seemed, had not forgotten him, or her own purpose in asking his address. And she had indeed sent money, given it simply to himself. It was lying for him in the bank. The letter explained that the writer had made inquiries of the Bishop and of the civil authorities, and what she had heard had convinced her that she could not do better than place a certain sum that happened to be at her disposal in the hands of Père Andrieux, to be used "for the restoration of the church or in any other way he might think best." And so she had sent the money.

Money indeed! Why it was a fortune. If she had sent a five pound note Mons. le Curé would have been enchanted. Perhaps, at the first moment, some such sum would have been more thoroughly enjoyable. He could have seen his way to dealing with that, *instantanément*. But *this!* Mons. le Curé was half frightened.

It was not the kind of thing one could take in all at once.

He sat so long over the remains of his meal that Mère Trouchon grew weary of poking her head up the cellar stairs to see if he was done, and when he did move at last, instead of setting out on his usual rounds, he surprised La Mère by stumbling down the stairs to the gloomy little room partitioned off for him at the end. There he picked up an armful of papers that had been accumulating for weeks on the top of his precariously-balanced bookshelf, and came to the surface again, to settle down to the little table, as soon as she had cleared it, with all sorts of printed sheets and brochures spread out before him. As she peeled the carrots for the soup, Mère Trouchon felt a little anxious about Mons. le Curé. He had an emotion, it would appear, and looked excited and unlike himself. What did it mean?

Those papers were, in fact, church furnishers' advertisements. Mons. le Curé had resolved to spend the morning in an orgy of imaginative splendour. There were other things that must be thought of before long. A letter of thanks would have to be written for instance. There, Mons. le Curé felt modest self-confidence. He would devote as much thought and energy of composition to that letter as ever he had done to sermon. It should speak the gratitude, not merely of his own heart, but of the whole congregation—the whole parish—nay, of the nation. It should be a public document, signed by the chief inhabitants. But first, Mons. le Curé designed for himself a morning of bliss. He would turn the pages of those advertisements, no longer with the hungry and hopeless eye of barren longing and admiration, but with the princely eye of the purchaser, the future controller of all that magnificence. He would plan things out provisionally, would select and reject, combine and design, take something here and something there. It was a crowded hour of glorious life that came to Mons. le Curé that morning, as he watched with his mind's eye the church of his dreams take shape and form, and blossom into richness of decoration.

It is to be feared that Mons. le Curé's taste left something to be desired. The æsthetic and superior-minded person would perhaps have shuddered at his dreams as nightmares, and have cast away many of his selections with horror. There was an entire want of any sort of unity of design in his projected scheme. The altar he most admired was probably of quite a different style in architecture from the reredos he proposed to put behind it, and the Tabernacle that his happy

pencil ticked with an approving mark, was of a type quite irreconcilable with either. All was fish that came to the net of Mons. le Curé. Classic and Gothic, Renaissance and Rococo—he revelled in them all, and combined them with reckless daring. If Our Lady was pleased with the shrine he planned for her, it must certainly have been because it was offered in overflowing love, and not for its artistic beauty. The crowning touch of all, the bit of novelty that gave him the keenest pleasure, was the shrine of St. Jeanne. He deliberated long between two fearful and wonderful designs, chose quite the most deplorably ornate, and with a sigh of satisfaction, laid down his pencil. The thing was, so to say, done. And it was no Alnascar's vision this, for there lay the letter that gave solidity and reality to the whole. Mons. le Curé read it over, once more, luxuriously.

Then he realized, with a start, that it was late, and he began hastily to read his Office before it should be time to go to the café for déjeuner.

The café was not a very splendid place nowadays. Mons. le Propriétaire had done what he could to set things in decent order, and his old customers resolutely shut their eyes to all deficiencies. But to-day it seemed to Mons. le Curé a palace, and his food was nectar and ambrosia. There was no need to strain veracity in saying so. The tremendous news that was still shut in his own bosom, threw a glamour even over horse steak and sour bread, and so engrossed his mind, that it was not till the meal was nearly over that he began to attend to the conversation around him.

Then he realized that the prevailing mood was in sharp contrast with his own. There was something terribly like despair in the looks and tones he observed. Had Mons. le Curé not heard the news? Was it possible? Eh bien! One could tell it in a few words, and the fewer the better perhaps, when it was news of such a kind. The cattle sent from Germany were proving to be cattle such as the Boches could very well spare. In a word, they were infected with the deadly "foot and mouth" disease. Government orders were out for their immediate slaughter. And so, just when one thought life was becoming possible again, here was ruin . . . among the ruins, staring one in the face. Some sort of compensation might, in the end, be looked for perhaps. But after what delays, what difficulties! Let Mons. le Curé figure to himself. So he could, very well indeed. And his pleasant thoughts

faded into the background in face of such imminent disaster.

He spent the afternoon in making visits, and every one was open-mouthed with the same story. There was no getting away from it for a moment, and Mons. le Curé even felt that there would be a subtle kind of selfishness in mentally taking refuge in his own happy thoughts.

He came wearily home that evening, and paused to rest, sitting on a crumbling end of wall at the back of the church. One of the villagers passed by, driving two miserable cattle, visibly sickening with the prevailing disease, and looking at them, as he sat there, a most unwelcome thought took shape in the mind of Mons. le Curé. It had been lurking somewhere in the shadows all day, that thought; now it stepped into the light and forced itself upon his conscious attention.

This money for the church, suppose it were spent, or most of it, at all events, on the purchase of healthy cattle? The difficulty could be met in that way certainly. . . . Mons. le Curé's eye strayed over the rubbish heaps—if the money was otherwise applied, what about the church? Was it even justifiable—surely one was bound to ask oneself that—to divert money intended for the church to other purposes, even charitable ones? For a moment Mons. le Curé's hopes revived, and the vision of the restored High Altar, and of St. Jeanne's shrine rose before his mind's eye in their glory. But across them he seemed to read the words of that magical letter—"For the restoration of the church or in any other way you may think best." It lay, after all, with him to decide.

Then he began to think of details. It was all very well to give that money to help men like Jules Trouchon, la Mère Trouchon's nephew, or the good Jacques Bounot. Certainly le bon Dieu would rather such men should be saved from ruin than that the church should be ever so splendid. *Bons enfants* they had always been, regular at their duties, well-conducted, devout. But what about Aristide Planchet for example? A bitter anti-clerical, ostentatiously disregardful of all obligations, spitefully vexatious to Mons. le Curé and his flock about every trifle that gave him an opening for annoyance, or that was what he had been in the pre-war days at all events. But his cattle were as sick as Jules Trouchon's. And personal grudges, or even just resentments, should not come into the question, which was, at bottom, the question of what le bon Dieu most wanted.

After a while, Mons. le Curé went stumbling up wearily

over the rubble and ruin, to the roofed-in part of the church, and knelt on one of the few remaining prie-dieus. It lurched uneasily on the uneven mud floor, which was not conducive to devotion, but the disorder within Mons. le Curé's own mind was such that he hardly noticed outside matters. Not for twenty years past had he suffered such interior disturbance; resentment, almost rebellion, seemed to possess his soul.

At first it seemed hopeless to pray. In despair he felt for his *chapelet*—and set to work. The very feeling of the beads between his fingers had something tranquillizing about it, but certainly Mons. le Curé was not in a prayerful mood. He began the Joyful Mysteries. The Annunciation, the Visitation. In the disorder of his thoughts neither seemed to have anything special for him at the moment. The Nativity—first with the same painful, arid effort—then with a sudden overwhelming sense of the correspondence between the inward and the outward. No room in the Inn. Why that is of course. He expects nothing else. He is used to that. No room in the church that has been thrown down by cruel hands (even as on that memorable day when Mons. le Curé found the buried Calvary). Well, He has known that experience before, too. He will not be surprised. But no room in the heart. Ah! there at least one may always manage to give Him a real disappointment. So full of one's own plans, even when they take the form of altars and shrines for the Blessed Saints, so crowded up with church furnishings that . . . there is no room.

Mons. le Curé bowed his grizzled head, and as he came to the fourth Joyful Mystery, he brought his own gift to the altar, and asked Our Lady to lay it there . . . with her Son. That gift was Mons. le Curé's will, and with it his dreams. No doubt she did so, for in the fifth Mystery he found, like her, what he sought, in the House of God.

When he went out, at last, through the roughly-made door that closed the roofed-in part of the nave, he met Mère Troughon limping up the uneven track. Had his reverence heard about the cattle? The good God only knew what would come of it. The old had not long to live anyhow, for her part she was willing enough to go, but there were the young. . . . At all events it was time to say a prayer. Jules' beasts had all sickened to-day. And his reverence looked worn out too. Her troubles seemed to grow into a long wailing litany.

"I will see Jules presently. If God wills something may be done." Mons. le Curé spoke very quietly. "Some funds have been furnished by a friend that may help the matter. But chut! ma mère, we will not say too much yet."

"Mons. le Curé . . . being a saint himself" . . . Mère Trouchon would say it whether he liked it or not . . . "had doubtless the aid of other saints. Help at such a time would be nothing else than a miracle of the good God."

"The good God" . . . as Mons. le Curé had had to remind his enthusiastic parishioner before now, "has other ways of working besides miracles." Let her be quiet and not talk nonsense; but say a prayer, and perhaps she would hear good news to-morrow.

Mère Trouchon looked impressed—but had a moan still to give vent to. "Ah! Mons. le Curé—if prayers would give us back the church as it used to be. It cuts one to the heart to see it. Did Mons. le Curé remember the little shrine of St. Anthony of Padua, for example, that used to be just here where the big block of stone lies. And the beautiful Stations, in gilt frames, that the good Madame d'Avray had given just before the war?"

Mons. le Curé remembered all the glories of the church that used to be, not less clearly than he remembered the glory of the church that was to have been, as he had seen it this morning. But there was a thought in his mind now to cheer Mère Trouchon and himself too.

"Never mind, ma mère; you will come to Mass among the rubbish heaps none the less, is it not so? If our Lord comes to us here, as He came once to the Manger, we need not complain, and if there is room for Him in our hearts when He comes, He will not complain either. I must step round to see Jules and the others now before bedtime—so adieu ma mère"—and as Mère Trouchon watched him, Mons. le Curé tramped away down what used to be the village street.

HELEN GRIERSON.

THE CHRONICLES OF MR. H. G. WELLS

FOR many months now the fortnightly parts of Mr. H. G. Wells' *Outline of History* have dazzled the eye and fired the imagination. There is no escape from these parts with their arresting covers—they are on the bookstalls of the most derelict railway-stations and in the dentist's waiting-room. And now that the first volume has appeared in book form, we may well pause and survey the *magnum opus*. For Mr. Wells' literary craftsmanship, his art of presentation, his selective judgment, and his courage in attempting such a gigantic task, it is impossible not to have admiration. And on this account it is the more regrettable that he has allowed his skill in fiction to mould what should be a record of fact. A man who writes a popular history ought not to make statements that are not generally accepted, or, if he does, he ought to substantiate them. Mr. Wells' volume bristles with assertions which either are not accepted by recognized authorities, or are matters of dispute amongst the learned.¹ Furthermore, this work suffers from the defect of all vulgarizations of science—it is some decades behind the times, and many of the theories upon which Mr. Wells confidently relies have been left high and dry by the advancing tide of speculation. In the short space at my disposal I propose to deal with a few of Mr. Wells' picturesque, but mischievous, inaccuracies.

"The pre-human ancestor was an ape," says Mr. Wells in his errata to parts I., II., III. He makes this statement with the confidence of a man who has established it beyond rebuttal. It is therefore worth while to examine the evidence on which it rests, the more so as the examination throws an interesting side-light on Mr. Wells' method of handling facts. Chief amongst the anthropological data upon which any judgment as to the simian origin of man must be based, are the extant remains of "primeval man," and these are usually divided into three groups:

i. Remains supposed to date from the late Pliocene or early Pleistocene epoch (c. 550,000 B.C.)—the *Pithecanthropus*, *Eoanthropus*, *Homo Heidelbergensis*, and the Galley Hill man.

¹ It is only fair to Mr. Wells to add that occasionally he gives in footnotes the annotations of experts who disagree with him.

ii. Remains of the *Homo Neanderthalensis*, or *Primigenius* (c. 50,000 B.C.).

iii. Remains of the *Homo sapiens*, or *recens* (c. 35,000 B.C.)—Aurignacian, Cro-Magnon, and Grimaldi types.

Mr. Wells' task is to show how the *Homo sapiens* evolved from an ape. He devotes a whole chapter (viii.) to the Pliocene man of group i., without shedding the faintest ray of light on his origin. He discourses pleasantly of *Pithecanthropus*, and illustrates his remarks with a picture of the "possible appearance" of *Pithecanthropus*—no mean achievement when we reflect that the entire remains consist of a thigh bone, two molar teeth, and the top of a skull. What he does not tell his readers, however, is that the *Pithecanthropus* is the discredited harbinger of the whole family of "missing links." Time was when popularizers of "Science," following the lead of Haeckel, insisted on the continuous, gradual development of man from the ape through this very *Pithecanthropus* type. Anthropologists, however, insisted that it was not at all clear that the Java remains belonged to the same skeleton, since, though found in the same strata, they were some considerable distance apart. The femur is universally admitted to be human, but many experts consider that the teeth are anthropoid. A fierce battle rages round the skull, some anatomists pronouncing it human, others simian, and others again declaring it to be an intermediate type. The date of the remains, too, is a very vexed question; and, finally, the whole status of the *Pithecanthropus* has been rudely shaken by the recent discovery of several supposed types of pre-historic man which differ essentially from the *Pithecanthropus*—notably the Piltdown man, at present in course of reconstruction from the remains found in Sussex as recently as 1912. As a "missing link," therefore, the *Pithecanthropus* is pretty generally abandoned, but Mr. Wells, though he has not succeeded in finding another to take its place, remains unshaken in his belief that the pre-human ancestor was an ape.

In the next chapter he addresses himself to a consideration of the primitive men represented by group ii. To these we are somewhat abruptly introduced as follows: "In the earlier phase, the third Interglacial period, a certain number of small family groups of men (*Homo Neanderthalensis*), and probably of sub-men (*Eoanthropus*), wandered over the land, leaving nothing but their flint implements to witness to their

presence" (p. 47). That is all very well, but what we want to know is, where did this *Homo Neanderthalensis* come from? The average reader of Mr. Wells' serial gathers the impression that this second type in some mysterious way "evolved" out of the first, and certainly Mr. Wells says nothing to undeceive him. Yet the gulf between these two groups has never been bridged. Thus Mr. E. O. James, in his recent *Introduction to Anthropology* (1919), says: "In our opinion *Pithecanthropus* does not represent either a precursor or an early phase of Neanderthal man, but a development on lines of its own . . . there is good reason to believe that the Neanderthal type does not represent a development of *Pithecanthropus*" (p. 12). And even if it did, it would not help Mr. Wells in the least, since he admits that after lasting out for more than 200,000 years the "Neanderthaler race" became extinct: "Finally . . . a different human type came upon the scene, and, it would seem, exterminated *Homo Neanderthalensis*" (p. 52). So, in any case, exit the man who was descended from an ape. Mr. Wells does not seem to have heard of the modern difficulties against his ape-ancestry theory. In the course of an article on "The Evolution of Man and his Mind," in *Science Progress* for July, 1920, Major Thomas Cherry contends that "back teeth" are not "evidence of our simian ancestry, but on the contrary, quite the opposite" (p. 89); that "Man's skin is not a monkey's skin minus the hair. It is far better supplied with sweat glands, and man can thus survive a degree of exposure to the sun which is speedily fatal to a monkey. Man's naked skin is a conspicuous contrast to the condition of all the other primates" (p. 92); and—sad blow to Mr. Wells, with his diagrammatic picture of "foot of man and gorilla"—"the specialized monkey foot may [thus] be ruled out as a stage in the ancestry of man" (p. 77). All this chatter of Mr. Wells about arboreal apes, and his highly imaginative descriptions of Pliocene and Neanderthal man are somewhat beside the point, since "no stage in the ancestry of man may have been very like either one or other of these extinct races" (*Science Progress*, p. 90). We are relieved, therefore, when Mr. Wells turns his attention, and ours, to the new human type, indicated by the third group of remains, the *Homo sapiens*, or *recens*. We are consumed with eagerness to know something of the antecedents of this race; we are thrilled to think that in this chapter Mr. Wells is at last about to solve

the knotty problem of our simian ancestry. But all the knowledge that Mr. Wells imparts on this vital question is compressed into one single period: "At present we can only guess where and how, through the slow ages, parallel with the Neanderthal cousin, these first *true men* arose out of some more ape-like progenitor" (p. 52. Mr. Wells' italics). So, after all, when it comes to discussing the origin of the first true men, Mr. Wells is only guessing! *Hinc illae lacrymae!* But to soften the blow the guess is accompanied by a coloured plate of "Our Neanderthaloid Ancestor." Observe the unobtrusive manner in which Mr. Wells bridges the gulf between groups ii. and iii. In a parenthesis, mark you, the extinct *Homo Neanderthalensis*, a type of "nearly human creatures," says Mr. Wells, is suddenly raised to the rank of cousin to the first true men. Mr. Wells is an adept at this kind of logical theft. Having, with the aid of a coloured plate, persuaded the reader that the *Homo Neanderthalensis* was almost human, Mr. Wells proceeds to foist him on to the British Public as a *cousin*! To such shifts is the new logic reduced in the interests of the inspiring belief that man is descended from an ape. *Venite adoremus!*

Most of Mr. Wells' earlier chapters are tendential. Wittingly or unwittingly he conveys the impression that a theistic hypothesis is superfluous in any rational interpretation of the universe. From Democritus to the latest rationalist, the favourite method of eliminating the Deity has always been to profess to account for the cosmos by describing the manner in which it has evolved. By a sort of legerdemain, description is substituted for explanation. It is as if we sought to show that a house need not have had a designer, by giving a minute description of the way in which its various parts give stability to the whole and depend on the foundation. Mr. Wells has a chapter (iii.) showing how Natural Selection accounts for the survival of the fittest, or, or as he prefers to call it, the survival of the fitter. But what, we may well ask, accounts for Natural Selection? As Dr. Flint remarks in his *Theism*, "Natural Selection did not bring about the conditions under which it operates. If the whole earth had been flooded with water only fish would have survived. There is clearly something which Natural Selection cannot account for." At the best it is a law, and presupposes a lawgiver. But is it even a law? Mr. Wells writes of it with the full-blooded confidence of the sciolist. He would write less confidently, per-

haps, had he read the "Essays in Commemoration of the Centenary of the Birth of Charles Darwin and of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the publication of *The Origin of Species*, edited for the Cambridge Philosophical Society and the Syndics of the University Press by Professor Seward, F.R.S." Among the contributors to this volume are Weismann, De Vries, Bateson, Francis Darwin, Thistleton-Dyer, Ernst Haeckel, and other master-exponents of evolution. And Mr. Wells may be surprised to hear that the one subject most hotly discussed by these experts is—Natural Selection. Bateson, for instance, says: "The time is not ripe for the discussion of the Origin of Species . . . we look on the manner and causation of adapted differentiation as still wholly mysterious" (p. 99). This, however, was written in 1909, and things have moved since then—but not in the direction of the theory favoured by Mr. Wells. Mr. Bourne, in his *Animal Life and Human Progress*, published in 1919, declares that the popular hypothesis, "extinction of the less fit, and survival of the fittest, no longer commands the universal assent of zoologists. Indeed, it has been seriously undermined by the discoveries of recent years" (p. 56). Nevertheless, it figures in Mr. Wells' illustrated pages as a doctrine beyond dispute, the basis of the drama "From Microbe to Man."

In the third part of his *History* Mr. Wells says: "This book is not a theological book, and it is not for us to embark upon theological discussion; but it is a part, a necessary and central part, of the history of man to describe the dawn and the development of his religious ideas and their influence upon his activities" (p. 77). Mr. Wells is here embarking on a very large subject—very much larger than he realizes. Various theories have been put forward by anthropologists to explain the manner of the making of gods by primitive peoples, and of these theories Mr. Wells selects the most unsatisfactory—the abandoned theory of ancestor-worship. Of this theory, Professor Jastrow, after dismissing Tylor's animistic theory, says: "Still less satisfactory is the theory chiefly associated with Herbert Spencer, which traces religion back to the worship of ancestors under the guise of ghosts as its sole factor. The theory rests on the supposition that the deities worshipped by primitive man are, in reality, the spirits of his ancestors" (*The Study of Religion*, p. 184). Mr. Wells is apparently unaware that the theory is chiefly associated with Herbert Spencer, for it is to that modern

Æsop, Grant Allen, that he refers us for scientific information as to how the "Old Man" of the tribe, after his death, became a god. "Grant Allen," says Mr. Wells with evident deference, "in his *Evolution of the Idea of God*, laid stress chiefly on the posthumous worship of the 'Old Man.'" Grant Allen, as a matter of fact, simply popularized Herbert Spencer, and as long ago as 1913 a Rationalist Press Association manual, treating of the book to which Mr. Wells sends his readers, said of Grant Allen: "His examples are taken without regard to the degree of culture of the tribes, and it is generally recognized that he has emphasized only one element in the making of gods" (*The Existence of God*, by Joseph McCabe, p. 24). It is now generally recognized that what Grant Allen emphasized is not an element in the making of gods at all. Grant Allen set out bravely "to show how in the great Jewish god himself we may discern, as in a glass, darkly, the vague but constant lineaments of an ancestral ghost-deity" (*The Evolution of the Idea of God*, p. 68). Possibly Mr. Wells is unacquainted with the exquisite comedy of Huxley and Spencer searching the scriptures for evidences of ancestor-worship. Huxley's success may be gauged by the fact that the most striking instances he cites are "the singular weight attached to the veneration of parents in the Fourth Commandment," and, if you please, the Ark of the Covenant—though how, precisely, he is at a loss to explain. So fruitless was his search that he abandoned it in disgust, and took refuge in the highly original theory that the evidences of ancestor-worship in the Old Testament must have been deliberately suppressed by pietistic copyists bent on bolstering up monotheism—presumably on the principle that the end justifies the means. Spencer, having found no evidence whatever of ghost-worship amongst the Hebrews, sententiously remarks that "the silence of their legends is but a negative fact, which may be as misleading as negative facts usually are," and proceeds with his theory as gaily as if he had established it up to the hilt.

To quote Grant Allen on this subject is simply ludicrous. To-day no reputable anthropologist takes even Huxley or Spencer seriously, much less Grant Allen. It is so objectively unlikely that the idea of a deathless god should have evolved in the savage mind out of the idea of a dead ancestor that all serious anthropologists, in the lack of any evidence for it, have abandoned the theory. The Supreme Being of

the savage belonged to a world that knew no death—the ghost of a dead man could never enter there. Ghosts and gods were never confused in the savage mind, however much Huxley, Spencer, and Grant Allen may have confused them. "Ghosts," says Crawford Howell Toy, "are shadowy doubles of human beings, sometimes nameless, wandering about without definite purpose except to procure food for themselves, uncertain of temper, friendly or unfriendly, according to caprice"; but "the god appears to have been at the outset a well-formed anthropomorphic being. His genesis is different from that of the ghost, spirit, ancestor or totem" (*Introduction to the History of Religion*, p. 266). The present state of expert opinion with regard to the theory advocated by Mr. Wells is thus voiced by Dr. Jevons: "The 'deified ancestor' theory, however, would have us believe that there was once a man named Zeus, who had a family, and his descendents thought that he was a god. . . . The fact is that ancestors known to be human were not worshipped as gods, and that ancestors worshipped as gods were not believed to have been human" (*Introduction to the History of Religion*, p. 302). And, again, he says quite bluntly: "Religion did not originate from ancestor-worship, nor ancestor-worship from religion" (*ibid.* p. 197). The Grant Allen theory to-day is not so much as mentioned amongst us. Thus, though Mr. E. O. James, in his recent manual of anthropology, devotes a whole chapter to "The Religion of Primeval Man," he says never a word on the theory which Mr. Wells commends to his readers with the calm assurance that it played an important part in building up "a complex something" which "we may call *religion*" (p. 77). Mr. Wells declares that in the compilation of his *History* he has consulted many experts, but experts in the study of religion do not seem to have been amongst the number. Instead of bethinking himself to Grant Allen, he might with profit have dipped into the pages of Toy, or Jevons, or Jastrow, and taken to heart the latter's warning anent theorists "with a decided prejudice against religion, which disqualifies them from judging religious phenomena calmly and dispassionately" (*The Study of Religion*, p. 181).

A careful investigation of the available material for the study of the history of religion has led many capable inquirers to conclude that the idea of God did not "evolve" at all, but was gathered, quite naturally, even by primitive

man, from a consideration of the phenomena of nature around him. Surely the intelligence with which the Grant Allen school insist on endowing primitive man—an intelligence sufficient to work out a belief in a beneficent Supreme Being from ghosts of doubtful character—would have been more than sufficient to enable the savage to discern a mover behind the bolt from the blue as readily as behind the arrow in its flight.

Of Mr. Wells' chronicles of civilized man I propose to treat in a separate article.

RICHARD DOWNEY.

HARVEST

HERE the corn is cut
And ablaze
In the westering sun,
Lies the harvest field,
Like a burnished shield
Of aurelian stubble.
Each blue-veined rut
Flows with cornflowers slain;
And, about the edge,
Continuous bubble
Of slaughtered poppies, like wine let run
To the last red drop . . . or footsteps in blood
To the lurking hedge,
Where shrinking daisies blanch in amaze.

Is earth's need of bread
So pressing, to warrant this toll of dead?
And infinite pain
To innocent creatures housed in the sod?
But ever the mills and the winepress of God
Work through Nature, to yield
The meaning and meed of that mystic rune
Read to Adam in Eden, unriddled one noon
On a hillside in Palestine. . . .
Vintage divine,
And harvesting reaped of the Rood.

MOTHER ST. JEROME.

LIMPIAS AND THE PROBLEM OF COLLECTIVE HALLUCINATION

I.

IF the word hallucination appears in the title of this article I should like from the beginning to point out that the term is here used, as the lawyers say, "without prejudice." No strictly accurate or scientific definition need be attempted for the purpose I have now in view, which is simply to record phenomena, without undertaking to explain them. At the same time it will be well to remember that every experience which may be rightly called an hallucination, in other words, every sensory perception which has no objective counterpart in the field of vision, is not necessarily to be regarded as deceptive and illusory. Modern psychical research is pretty generally agreed in classifying that large group of phenomena called "apparitions at the point of death," as hallucinations, but it is nevertheless admitted that these are often coincidental and veridical. There is no solid body, no material form, where the percipient believes he discerns such bodies and forms, but it may still be absolutely true that there has been some psychical invasion from outside. The hallucination corresponds with events that are happening, have happened, or will happen elsewhere, and, moreover, there is some sort of causal connection, however difficult of analysis, between the external happenings and the present perception.¹ The same may often be said of the visions seen by the "skryer" in the crystal at which he is gazing. Certainly the distant event is not there in the crystal, as a star, for example, is in the mirror of a reflecting telescope. The vision is therefore an hallucination; but it may at the same time be veridical, in as much as it corresponds with a scene which is perhaps at that moment being enacted a hundred miles away.

The subject of the present article has been suggested by the manifestations reported to have taken place last year at Limpias, not far from Santander, on the north coast of Spain. There can apparently be no question that the very beautiful wooden crucifix which adorns the sanctuary of the parish

¹ For all this see F. W. Myers, *Human Personality*, Vol. I, pp. 247-252.

church has drawn thither vast pilgrimages, consisting of many thousands of persons, from all the surrounding districts. The suffering face of our Saviour, which wears the crown of thorns, and has its eyes open and upraised, the head being somewhat thrown back against the cross, and a little inclined to the left, is seen at times to move its eyes, to change colour, and to open and close its lips, while drops of blood of vivid red trickle down the cheeks until lost to view in the darker convolutions of the hair and beard. In sum, the pilgrims who are favoured with the vision, for not by any means all are so privileged, see, not a rigid wooden carving, but the living face of a sufferer in the throes of his death agony. As to the fact that countless spectators, many of them well-educated and at first incredulous, have had this experience, often continued and renewed for hours together, there cannot be a doubt. I derive my information principally from three articles in *La Ciencia Tomista*, a high-class theological magazine, conducted by the Spanish Dominicans.¹ The writer, Father Luis Urbano, O.P., is not only a distinguished theologian, but also a Doctor of Science. The articles in question appear to have raised a storm of protest among the ranks of some of the ultra-devout, because the author, while fully admitting the genuineness of the manifestations, and not denying the possibility of their supernatural character, declares them nevertheless to be subjective and not objective. Approaching the matter in this critical spirit, and showing, by frequent references, his acquaintance with the latest views of modern agnostic psychology as presented in the treatises of A. Marie, Sanford, William James, Raymond, etc., as well as with the teaching of St. Thomas and the scholastics, he naturally inspires confidence when he sets before us three narratives, typical, as he says, of the experiences of the best class of witnesses. He describes this testimony, selected from a large collection of similar accounts, as calm, sincere, competent, and veracious. Two of his witnesses are medical men and the other a lady. Unfortunately, in view of the length of their descriptions, I must be content with a mere summary.

The lady, writing to her brother, a Franciscan, declares that soon after entering the church she saw the eyes of the crucifix shut (they are, as photographs show, wide open in the carved

¹ See "Los prodigios de Limpías a la luz de la Teología y de la Ciencia" in *La Ciencia Tomista*, Sept. 1919 to Jan. 1920, pp. 153-171; 301-317; 41-52, also reprinted separately.

figure), one of them especially, as if it had been closed by a violent blow. On the cheek she observed, trickling down one after another, drops of living blood, which were lost to view under the ear at the level of the mouth. This manifestation she saw three times, but no more. On the other hand, the opening of the eyes and their movement from side to side she observed an infinite number of times. It was going on throughout the whole evening. The mouth also often opened and shut, the countenance changed colour. A flush spread from the face across the breast, and even reached the arms, as if the whole were living flesh. This, she declares, was observed by the greater number of those present.

Though I felt certain of what I saw [she adds], still to make more sure and for my own greater satisfaction, I shifted my position and went over to the opposite side; but I saw the same there. If I told you that I saw our Lord for a time without the crown of thorns and his countenance enveloped in a sort of cloud, would you believe it? Well I assure you that I would lay down my life to prove the truth of what I relate, and I would swear it on the Gospels. All that I say is the simple truth. I did not at that moment see our Lord suffering, nor any anguish in the face. Quite the contrary. His look was all tenderness and serenity. . . . Let me add that on other occasions I had looked at the crucifix with opera glasses and had seen nothing. On this Saturday I used only the naked eye and I saw what I tell you.

The next witness cited by Father Urbano is a certain Dr. Maximilian Orts, medical officer of the district of Pravia. He had gone to Limpias in the company of intimate friends of the writer himself. After dwelling on the anatomical details of the figure, Dr. Orts, who was standing in the middle of the nave, about seven or eight yards from the sanctuary, and using a pair of binoculars, describes how he saw a drop of blood, red and luminous, ooze from the right eye and trickle across the cheek until it was absorbed in the lock of hair which the artist had carved below the ear.

The blood gradually disappeared until the tract of skin it had crossed was left quite clear (*limpia*). To the surprise occasioned by the sight of this phenomenon, there succeeded a spirit of contradiction. It was humiliating for a man of my age, with my large professional experience, to be made the victim of an hallucination. I am a Catholic, but I am not a fanatic. Worried by the abnormality of what I had witnessed, I rested a while,

I collected my thoughts and then turned to look again, confident that the phenomenon would have disappeared. It was not so. The blood continued to gleam and to trickle on. I compared this blood with that which came from the wound of the left hand and that which showed on the right breast of the figure, and the comparison proved to me that the latter was black blood, painted blood, while the other was crimson, blood which had movement and life in it.

Dr. Orts then tried to persuade himself that some optical illusion, the reflection of some streak of red colour, had produced the effect that startled him. He looked at the brow and temples, and there for the moment he sees grey hair glistening with the moisture of perspiration, then a shadow, and after that the vivid crimson of blood, soon to be absorbed by the hair until eventually the grey locks showed again. He shifted his position to a side chapel, but the whole phenomenon was repeated, until, convinced against his will, he cried out aloud in the hearing of the group that surrounded him: "There can't be a doubt; it *is* blood."

The third account, which, like the two others, was given publicly by many Spanish newspapers in the early part of August, 1919, is that of Dr. Gutierrez de Cossio, who, besides his medical duties, also acts as Consul for Honduras at Santander. He calls attention, first to the difficulty that in so crowded, tumultuous and distracting an assembly as he found gathered in the church, anything like auto-suggestion should be possible. At the moment of which he speaks, a preacher had finished addressing the pilgrims, and in obedience to the efforts which were being made to get them to leave the church, a number were crowding to the sacristy door on the left of the crucifix. Suddenly a cry arose in the group which surrounded him. They exclaimed that our Lord's eyes had turned towards the pilgrims who were departing. Dr. Gutierrez saw clearly the change of direction in the look, and then the eyes gazed straight down the church and finally were raised to Heaven in their normal position. After an interval, as another body of pilgrims went out, the same thing happened again, and this was repeated many times. Most of those in his neighbourhood perceived this movement of the eyes, with the exception of a group of fashionable people on his right, who, gazing at the crucifix with opera glasses, could make out nothing at all. Many declared that the lips opened and closed again, but he himself did not perceive this. After

a while a number of the pilgrims passed into the sacristy to sign, after taking an oath, the book which served as a record of the witnesses of the "miracle." But Dr. Gutierrez returned to the church, and there, standing on the sanctuary step, amid a dense crowd, and in an atmosphere that was positively asphyxiating, he observed an extraordinary series of changes passing over the features of the crucified figure. As a medical man of long experience he averred that he recognized each stage in the approach and final victory of death, the sharpness of the nose, the blue tint and tightening of the lips, the prominence of the cheek bones. "I was as much affected," he writes, "as if I had never seen a man die. In the whole of my medical career nothing has ever impressed me so much, not even at the beginning of my experiences in the dissecting-room when in my student days I first saw a corpse laid out before me upon the table."

To these accounts I must add one further description which appeared in *The Universe* (March 26, 1920), and which was there said to emanate from a hard-headed business man, personally known to the contributor of the article. It illustrates the failure of witnesses to see what they expected to see, at the same time that manifestations occurred of a quite different kind. I give only the more striking details:

At the end of the *Missa Cantata* a lady beside me cries: "Look the eyes are moving towards the left." Many people rise (I among them) and approach the sanctuary. Then the lady, weeping, cries, "Look, see how He is looking!" Two other ladies see the same. Several of us who are present see nothing. The lady takes me by the arm: "Here, Sir, look!" I see nothing except the tranquil features of our Lord. We are there over half an hour and, among more than forty persons, there are only three who see these wonders.

The next day, after the Stations of the Cross, a sermon was delivered, and while the preacher was still speaking,

Six or seven in the bench next to mine cry out simultaneously: "A miracle, a miracle! On your knees!" The women weep and make various exclamations. On my right a man falls on his knees crying: "Pardon O Lord!" A lady in my bench on my right, wearing glasses, says: "Do you see anything, Sir?" "Nothing, Madam!" I look with my opera glasses and see nothing. The church is full of people; nobody sees the movements of the divine eyes except the seven who are in the last

bench, and we who are beside them and place ourselves in the same position see nothing. . . . But our Lord has also graces for me which I shall never forget. Soon after the beginning of the Solemn Mass of the first pilgrimage I see that a kind of cloud rises, spreads and covers the feet, then the body, the arms and later all the cross of the Christ of the Agony, and only the divine Face remains with its powers, most tranquil and beautiful, and at the same time all is illumined with golden light most intense. After some moments—I do not know how many—this cloud disappears, or rather passes, which I see as clearly as one sees a cloud passing over the sun. At the end of Mass I see the same phenomenon, which I watch more tranquilly, but with the same wonder.

This witness adds that others dining near him at the inn spoke of having seen nothing, but one of the party, curiously enough, had discerned the same sort of cloud which is described by the narrator himself. It rose from the feet, covering by degrees all the body, everything in fact except the divine face, which was illuminated with the most brilliant light.

One point which seems to stand out clearly from the evidence available is that a very considerable proportion of those who go to Limpías see nothing. Father Urbano, without making any explicit statement, leaves the impression that this is the case with the majority of the pilgrims.¹ The parish priest of Limpías, it appears, has himself never witnessed the prodigy. The only thing he has seen are the crowds of penitents whose confessions he is asked to hear. If the vision was strictly objective, and if the eyes of the crucifix really moved, nothing ought to be easier than to obtain a photograph of our Saviour's face at a moment when the eyes were not turned to Heaven, as normally, but gazing downwards or sideways at the pilgrims. In that case doubt would be impossible; but I have heard of no such photograph. Meanwhile, Father Urbano, after careful inquiry, sums up the external facts of the case in these terms:

¹ The argument he quotes (Sept.—Oct. p. 170) from *Rosas y Espinas* would lose all point if those who were disappointed did not considerably outnumber their more fortunate companions; and compare further what he says about the desirability of keeping a book in the sacristy to preserve the signatures of those who have seen nothing. (Nov. and Dec. p. 316.) A very devout lady who had gone with a party to Limpías wrote to him: "We gazed until all our heads and eyes ached with looking, but we saw nothing. We came away with less faith than we had when we went there."

1. Not all the faithful who are present in the church perceive the movements of the crucifix, whereas those of them who see affirm that it moves.
2. Not all those who see, see the crucifix move in the same way at the same time.
3. On many occasions there are swoons, violent tremors, heart attacks, and cases of nervous disorder, either at the moment the prodigy is seen, or subsequently as a consequence of it. These cases yield to treatment with ordinary remedies and restoratives.
4. When vision comes, it comes [not to the whole assembly, but] to individuals or groups, and almost always in the course of pilgrimages, or great gatherings, under the influence of sermons, the singing of hymns, or the cries of the people.
5. The movements seen in the crucifix are confined to the face or at most to the bust of the figure. They are slow, but not rhythmical, and occur at irregular intervals. There is no suggestion that the crucifix has ever been heard to speak.
6. Remarkable effects have followed from these manifestations in the way of conversion and change of life. Some few cures in the physical order have also occurred.

Dismissing for the present these recent happenings at Limpas, it will be well to turn our attention to some older examples of similar phenomena which will be interesting at least for the purpose of comparison. The earliest of which any reliable details have been preserved seems to belong to the city of Prato, not far from Florence, in the year 1484. Although I have not had access to any more trustworthy source than the account given in Gumpenberg's *Atlas Marianus*, a work of the seventeenth century, still two narratives in manuscript written by contemporaries are in existence at Prato itself, and there can be little doubt that these have directly or indirectly supplied the materials from which that writer drew his information.¹ The devotional object which gave rise to scenes closely analogous to those occurring at Limpas was a picture of Our Blessed Lady known as the Madonna delle Carceri. Our Lady is said first to have appeared on July 6, 1484, to a little boy of eight, and then to Nicholas Guidetto, another lad of thirteen, who shortly afterwards died. The story was talked about and special devotion began to be paid to the picture, until, at last, in the

¹ One of these was written by Giuliano Guizzelmi who, as he was born in 1446, must have been 38 years old when the prodigy occurred; the handwriting of the other MS. is also of the fifteenth century. Both these sources were probably used by A. Baldanzi in his *Ristretto delle Memorie della Città di Prato*, Firenze, 1774. See Pontecchi, *Bibliografia Pratense*, pp. 122-123, 156, 157.

presence of the Vicar-General and a crowd of other witnesses, the face of the Madonna began to change its expression, to shed tears, and sometimes to close its eyes and then to open them again. Many came to venerate the shrine, beseeching Our Lady's aid in their troubles and infirmities, and it was believed that many miracles were wrought. Amongst the rest, Ridolfo, the infant son of Domenico Ghirlandaio, the great artist, was suddenly restored to health in a grievous sickness.¹ Father Gumpfenberg observes concerning the manifestations of 1484:

Another thing which I account very remarkable, was the continuous change of expression, which was not observed by one witness but by all the crowds who came there, for at one time the picture showed itself sad and pale, at another smiling and joyous. The movements of the eyes and the intensity of their gaze varied repeatedly and in a most wonderful way. Neither were these manifestations confined to the brief space of an hour or two, but to impress the sceptical and the strong-minded these things happened many times over, and for whole days together. In the space of two years and a half, forty-seven days were counted on which the Blessed Mother looked upon her clients with a countenance transformed.²

I do not dwell on this, but this brief account is of value as showing that such occurrences as that at Limpias have constantly been known at times when there has been any great outbreak of popular devotion. But there is another incident of precisely similar character with regard to which we possess much fuller information. In the year 1796 there occurred in Italy, and especially in Rome and the States of the Church, a sort of epidemic of what unfriendly Protestant critics scoffingly described as "winking Madonnas." The threat of French invasion no doubt at that time rendered devout Italians peculiarly susceptible to such influences, and the marvels said to have taken place at so many favoured shrines were interpreted by the patriotic as an earnest of the special protection of Heaven. None the less, there remains a body of evidence regarding these alleged prodigies which renders it impossible to question the sincerity of the thousands of witnesses who were convinced that they had seen them. The Cardinal Vicar, Cardinal Somaglia, appointed a commission to inquire into the evidence. Many hundred witnesses, who

¹ *Bibliografia Prutenica*, p. 157 note.

² *Atlas Marianus*, Munich edn., 1672, n. 334, p. 443.

were examined on oath, gave testimony in the most positive language to what they believed they had seen, and in a few months—the prodigies began on July 9, 1796, and the decree of approbation was dated February 28, 1797—the Cardinal Vicar pronounced authoritatively that “the depositions superabundantly prove the reality of the said astonishing and miraculous event in the twenty-six representations hereafter specified.” As a result, permission was given to publish and circulate a narrative of “this marvellous moving of the eyes in the above-named sacred pictures,” and furthermore, a few months later, the same Cardinal Vicar “granted to the Clergy of Rome an Office with a Mass in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary, to be recited and celebrated every year on the 9th of July, to commemorate the miraculous motion of the eyes in several of her pictures, which began in this city on that day of the year last past, 1796.” The annual festival which was thus to be celebrated was to be kept with the rite of a “greater double.” A book was issued under the editorship of Mgr. G. Marchetti containing a copious summary of the evidence. It was at once translated into French, and in 1801 into English, not omitting some quite excellent little engravings of the twenty-six pictures referred to. The title of the English version takes this form: “Official Memoirs of the Juridical Examination into the Authenticity of the Miraculous Events which happened in Rome in the years 1796—1797.” This was not, however, the first account of these occurrences printed for the edification of English Catholics. A little pamphlet had been published in the year 1796, consisting of extracts from letters written by students and others in Rome to friends in England.¹ Here are a few specimens:

Saturday the 9th, a celebrated picture of the Blessed Virgin, called la Madonna de l'Archetto, was seen by several persons to open and shut its eyes, and put on a very melancholy aspect. This was followed by about twenty pictures in different parts of the city; all of which opened and shut their eyes in a most miraculous manner. . . . I myself can testify to have seen this miracle in four different pictures. But how shall I describe to you my feelings on this occasion? I could scarce stand on my legs. I returned thanks to God for having brought me to the knowledge of a religion under the special protection of such

¹ *Miraculous Events established by Authentic Letters from Italy*, London, 1796. The pamphlet was edited by George Bruning.

a Patroness. I blessed you, and blessed the day that first brought me to Winchester.¹

Not all the writers are quite so positive in their affirmations. Thus we read in a letter from the Rev. Robert Smelt² to a Mrs. Canning, dated Rome, July 23, 1796:

The good people of Rome are become very pious. Several pictures of the Madonna opened and shut their eyes. This miracle first began at Ancona, afterwards at other places, and lately at Rome. I saw one picture close its eyes, at least I thought so. However several persons of undoubted veracity affirm positively that they have seen the same repeatedly.

John Burke, studying philosophy at the English College, writes, July 23, 1796, to his father in London, of the astonishing wave of piety which has swept over the city. He says that "wherever you go, you see nothing but processions of penance. Our college went last Thursday in one of these processions to St. Peter's, in which there were more than forty thousand persons." He also states, in explanation of this re-ekindling of piety:

The greatest prodigies are seen here every day. Many pictures of the Blessed Virgin have been seen to open and shut their eyes, of which prodigy I have been a witness two or three times, and they still continue. Some statues of Saints have altered their position, some crucifixes have likewise opened their eyes, for which reason Rome is turned into a second Ninive.

But it will be well to supplement these somewhat casual impressions by a few extracts from the depositions taken under oath in the official Roman inquiry. The accounts are often alarmingly diffuse, but the points of chief importance can be indicated while eliminating verbal redundancies. The first of the Roman Madonnas in which the phenomena above described were noticed was a representation of the Mother of Mercy, known as the Madonna "dell' Archetto." One of the deponents, Father Goani, a Franciscan, 46 years of age, who had filled responsible positions in the

¹ Letter of Stephen Green to Dr. John Milner, dated July 29, 1796. Mr. Stephen Green was a convert, who was then a subdeacon of the English College, Rome. He afterwards led an exemplary life as a priest at Greenwich, where he died in 1815, of typhus caught in attending the sick.

² The Rev. Robert Smelt, whose true name was Archdeacon, was at this time the agent in Rome of the English Clergy.

Order, and had taken his degree as Doctor of Divinity at the University of Florence, was a witness of the manifestations on July 9, 1796, the very first day of their occurrence. He had been summoned to the spot by a lay-brother, who came to him breathless to tell him of the prodigy that was happening. Father Goani declares that he gave no credence to the story. He thought it was due to an excited imagination, and that it was a mere echo of certain wonders that had just before been reported from Ancona. He refused, in fact, to leave his room, but afterwards noticing the crowds gathering in the street, he was led by curiosity to visit the picture. On his way he met a friend, a certain Mgr. Casali, and they both together took up their position directly in front of the painting at the distance of about a couple of yards (*una canna e mezza*). His account then goes on—I quote the published English translation, which I have compared with the original Italian:¹

My eyes were fixed on those of the Virgin, because I was told that the miraculous movement was there observed. An immense crowd of people filled the street which faces the picture. The faithful continued to pray aloud, and frequently I heard the people exclaim: *Evviva Maria! ecco che muove gli occhi!* (Oh! see how the Virgin moves her eyes!). Although I kept my eyes attentively fixed on the painting I could perceive no change, and this strengthened me in the idea I had conceived that the whole was the effect of a heated imagination. . . . I remained there about three quarters of an hour to make my observations with the eye of a critic.

Mgr. Casali then got tired and went away without seeing anything. Father Goani, however, stayed on, because he wanted to be able to say that he had seen the whole thing out and had discerned no change in the picture. Then, after waiting a little longer—

On a sudden, when I least expected it, I perceived a visible and manifest motion in both the eyes. I observed that the ball of the eye moved, that the pupils ascended by degrees, and so far concealed themselves under the upper eyelids, that nothing but the white of the eyes could be seen. I saw, moreover, after a very short interval, the same pupils with a slow and uniform motion descend to their prior position. . . . This perpendicular

¹ *De' Prodigii Avvenuti in molte sagre immagini, specialmente di Maria Santissima, secondo gli autentici Processi compilati in Roma, Memorie, etc.* By Don G. Marchetti, Rome, 1797.

movement I observed two other times successively. . . . The overflowing sentiments of my heart at that moment could no longer be restrained, and I felt the tears trickling down my cheeks. I must not omit some other circumstances that accompanied the prodigy. The first is, that at the instant the ball of the eye began to move, I perceived a very thin shade that rather darkened the white. But this shade was instantly dissipated; for at the moment of the elevation of the pupils, I observed again the same white just as before. The second circumstance is that the movement was attended with much grace and majesty. . . . The third that at the precise moment I observed the supernatural movement it was attested by the extraordinary cries, prayers and acclamations of all there present.

Father Goani, on the pretext of attending to a guttering candle, then had some steps brought and mounted them until his eyes were close to the picture, in order to satisfy himself that no mechanical artifice had been employed. He examined the canvas closely, particularly the eyes of the painting, and "perceived the varnish to be perfectly smooth without the least vestige of any fraud." Two days later, while these astonishing movements still continued, he used the steps again, taking with him a pair of compasses or dividers.

While [he says] the pupil was almost concealed under the superior eye-lid, I applied one point of the compass to its lower extremity, then barely visible, and I fixed the other point to the rim of the lower eye-lid. By this operation I was qualified to take the exact dimensions of the white part or cornea of the eye which appeared, and I found it to be about five lines or half an inch. The pupil of the eye soon re-occupying its former position, no portion of the white was any longer visible, as the pupil touched the inferior eye-lid.¹

He avers that while he still stood there close to the picture the whole series of ascending and descending movements of the eyes was repeated. Still, as against any claim to regard this compass experiment as decisive, the fact must surely be borne in mind that the picture was glazed, though the witness declares that the glass was kept clean and perfectly transparent.

The reader will not have failed to observe that when Father Goani and his friend, Mgr. Casali, first placed themselves in

¹ *Official Memoirs of the Juridical Examination into the Authenticity of the Miraculous Events which happened at Rome in the years 1796-7*, by Don Giov. Marchetti, translated by the Rev. B. Rayment, London, 1801, pp. 15-20.

front of the Madonna, the crowd "frequently" cried out that the eyes were moving; yet neither of them at that time could distinguish any appearance of change in the picture. It must consequently be inferred that a general clamour of this kind can in no way be accepted as proof that *all* who were present were witnesses of the prodigy. Indeed, just as at Limpias, the contrary is evident from the admissions made in the depositions of the witnesses themselves. The English translator of the *Official Memoirs*, from which I have been quoting, discloses in a footnote (p. 24) the fact, which appears to be ignored, or at any rate kept in the background, in the text of the work itself, that "the consolation (of witnessing the miracle) was denied to a few very creditable and very virtuous characters in Rome." He supposes that the Almighty admitted these exceptions "to prove that the stupendous events were not the effect of any art or mechanism of man, but the work of the right hand of the Most High." And he goes on to say that "it is an incontrovertible fact, that of the persons who have never been permitted to witness the miracle at Rome, some, on examining the weight of evidence and the cloud of witnesses that confirm the prodigy, have acknowledged their conviction and yielded their assent." This does not seem much to say; for many, like Father Urbano, who hold that there has been no real objective movement in picture or crucifix, may be quite willing to admit that the hallucination was preternaturally caused, or at any rate, was not purely terrestrial in its origin. Some of the evidence which crops up accidentally in the depositions regarding those who did not see, is distinctly curious and interesting. Thus in connection with a Madonna at the high altar of S. Nicolà de' Lorensi, we learn that a Father Rinaldi, who perceived movements of the eyes some time before, when no one else thought of them, "did not see the prodigy on the day that all the rest observed it, and this privation excited in him lively sentiments of his own unworthiness." So also, in the account of a Madonna under the arch of Santa Maria in Vallicella, we are told that an English surgeon, a Mr. Porter—

forcing his way with difficulty through the crowd placed himself exactly opposite. It happened however to him, as it had done to others, that when he first heard the people protest with their usual notes of admiration and joy, "See how she moves her eyes!" he could observe no change whatever. But at the moment he least expected, the miraculous movement appeared

to him distinctly visible. The upper eyelid, which the artist had made to cover about half the circle of the pupils, gradually ascended, as the eye-lids of a man who wishes to open his eyes.

Practically speaking, the phenomena observed in Rome in 1796 were confined entirely to this feature. The eyes of these various Madonnas were perceived to open or to close, to move horizontally or vertically, but with various peculiarities minutely detailed by the many hundreds of people of all ranks of society, from the highest nobility to peasants and artisans, who deposed to what they had seen. In a number of cases step-ladders were used, as by Father Goani, which allowed the observer to look into the eyes of the picture at the distance of no more than a foot or two, and even under these circumstances, the witnesses swore that they saw the movements as before. Several of the pictures were taken out of their frames and left upon chairs or stands, a few feet only from the ground, in order that they might be more accessible. In the church known as "Degli Agonizanti," a picture of the Madonna Addolorata was taken out of its frame, and the people begged the priest, a certain Father Pietro Meli, to bless them with it. He complied, and then "when he turned the face of the picture towards him to deposit it again on the altar, he witnessed the miraculous movement of the pupils while he was actually holding it in his hands. Already unnerved by what he had seen in the morning, his emotion was now so great that he fainted away." Neither was this the only incident of the kind. But what I have said must suffice for the curious series of "hallucinations" of 1796. A number of more or less analogous examples of comparatively recent date must be reserved for another article.

HERBERT THURSTON.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

THE *Times* Literary Supplement for June 3rd had one of its theological articles in which it mused on an "aspect" of the function which it considers that the League of Nations may undertake and succeed in fulfilling. Europe, it says, has fallen away from the unity which in former days fashioned her into a great family guided by the Church, and requires to build for herself, and indeed for the whole world, a new spiritual power which can succeed into the Church's place, and be a controlling organization which will "express primarily the common strivings of man's nature after an ideal life, and his recognition in the world of presiding Goodness, and which must at the same time become a recognized part of the temporal order, and, in the last resort, wield a more august and a more effective influence than do temporal governments themselves." It cites M. Emile Faguet as acknowledging that the Catholic Church more nearly corresponded to the spiritual force sought for than any substitute that man has so far been able to propose, but that Comte's "religion of humanity" was the nearest approach to such a substitute that had so far been made. But the *Times* essayist, while rejecting Comte's suggestion as a "proved failure," pronounces that "the strength of the Roman Church, if it can be called strength, is to have suspended the thought of spiritual progress altogether," and hence made herself impossible for the resumption of her old function in this respect, as will appear more and more strikingly as knowledge is more popularized.

Still our critic thinks a certain advantage is destined to follow from this "dethronement of organized religion." It has become at length possible to widen considerably the circumscription of the moral world to which this new spiritual power, now in the throes of proximate birth, is destined to impart its moral guidance:

If the truths of Christianity, even in Christian countries, are matters about which men are inclined as much to argue as to agree, their quarrels themselves enable them to appreciate more

clearly the limits of the specifically religious domain, and to recognize that differences of religious faith are compatible with substantial unanimity in regard to the general meaning and programme of human life and the direction which should be given to it. . . . It would seem characteristic of the time in any case . . . to regard the problems of the religious life as predominantly individual and to found the hope of world-wide spiritual co-operation on the desire, now almost universal, to make the world in which we live a better place to live in for us all.

In developing this thought, the *Times* writer lays down, as a feature of the present age, that it is a time of divorce between the religious and the spiritual. He means to say that religion is destined in future no longer to be a general characteristic of the family union which is to take the place of the old unity of nations under the leadership of the Holy See, but at best, to be a specific element in one of the many constituent forces that are to coalesce into the great human family. The conception, on the other hand, of spirituality is moving along entirely new lines which this critic is disposed to think more Christian:

The age is materialistic, and from its materialism we are learning the spiritual value of the material vehicle. One of the chief aims of our devotion is to redeem mankind from the bondage of poverty, and we see that the necessary means to this end is a new material equipment. . . . Thus a new route leads to an old discovery. We become humanitarians once more, only we see men's brotherhood on its mechanical side and conceive of its realization in terms of coal or oil or electricity. Impelled by a spiritual motive our action assumes a material bias and, beginning outside the walls of the Church, it leads us to perceive that there is but one Church after all, and that is the whole human family. . . . In fact, a natural co-operation is set up between the two elements necessary to the establishment of a universal spiritual authority.

It might seem from the terms of this somewhat vague statement, that in the essayist's view, the whole question of religion and morality can be left to settle itself as soon as a sufficiency of corn and wine and electricity is secured, which will surely be done with ease when this new spiritual force gets into action. It is a notion that one school of socialists entertains, whilst this *Times* writer does not seem to contemplate that other causes of social conflict are to be feared any longer.

One is reminded as one reads this writer's paper of the paper on Pig's Philosophy in Carlyle's *Latter Day Pamphlets*. For "Pig's-wash" substitute corn and oil and electricity, and there you have the whole system almost as Carlyle laid down its laws.

But what is to be the mode of action of this universal spiritual authority? One thing is, according to this writer, certain. It is not to attempt to codify any body of truth which may one day command the general allegiance of men. Rather it is to leave the influence of Christ for Christians, of Mahomed for Mahommedans, of democracy for democrats, of Guild Socialism for Guild Socialists, to grow each by its inherent virtue, and recognize that the first need of the day is collaboration for practical ends, and that the spiritual quality of the collaboration will belong to it, not because it is associated with any kind of formulated creed, but by virtue simply of the living associations of human thought and will: it will establish itself in other words, by that inherent tendency of innumerable private judgments and individual wills, which as long experience proves, invariably leads to universal agreement and stable unity!

Presently this writer goes on to indicate the directing power, which will be marked out in the present conjuncture of affairs, as a power competent to bring all this about by the recognized superiority of its organizing and governing capacity. It is the League of Nations which has just come into existence, the fitness of which for the task we can all appreciate, adopting a term that used to be said of God, "If there were not a God it would be necessary to invent Him." The writer does not furnish his readers with much instruction as to how this system will have to work; he limits himself to laying down that "the forces from which our life proceeds must be so disposed, by the controlling action of this overruling agency, that they will 'enhance and not negate one another,' and by so doing, cause 'life to become profounder, richer, and more intense.'"

The writer is profuse enough in his words, but what we have given is practically all he has to communicate. Nor is it necessary to prognosticate what will be the outcome of this system, should it ever come into existence on the lines which this writer desires. For anyone capable of thinking out the methods and motives of human action, the outcome of such a system may well seem too inevitable to need proving.

It will be enough, at all events, to indicate briefly one or two out of the innumerable points that will arise in connection with it. The writer says, not without reason, that a principal task of the guiding power will be to harmonize the different views which will be urged as to what is required in order to make the world better for humanity. But are they all likely to agree on this initial point? As between France and England, are not serious grounds of dispute already coming to the front. In what proportions, with what preferences, are the funds that are to be obtained from the Germans to be divided between the different countries of the allies, or given to one rather than to another? Are the classes, whether in England or France, or elsewhere, likely to take the same view as to the proportion in which the goods of their respective countries should be shared between the educated and the uneducated—or proletariat, as the latter delights to call itself? Are the people who placarded at Amritsar the fate to which they proposed to submit English ladies, likely to have the same ideas as to the betterment of the world as those in the world who call themselves Christians of one or another of the infinite varieties of which the present age has cognisance? And what about the ideas of world-betterment of the Russian party we call the Bolsheviks? So far they have no part in the League of Nations, and hence have no part in the control which the world is considered to need. But will this be so always? As it is, let us ask ourselves whether those who now constitute, or are likely in the near future to constitute, the administrative power of this League, are a class in whose capacity we can place that special confidence without which it cannot be expected that they will be able to exercise much influence. As originally conceived, the idea was that it would embody a fund of unified political and military force to suppress any States who might try to disturb in future the world's peace. This was an intelligible object, though it involved a mutual agreement and readiness to undertake irksome responsibilities which many people from the first have doubted whether the Allied Powers would be equal to facing; and the result so far has been rather to confirm than to remove that scepticism. For some time yet the League must remain inadequate to effect the limited political object for which it is designed—the discouragement of war as a means of settling international disputes. But even when it embraces all the world and, in its Assembly, represents the peoples

of the world, how is it likely, on a purely material basis, to bring about a unity, which, if it is to exist at all, must spring from a spiritual source, the recognition of God as Father and Judge and of the common origin and destiny of all His rational creatures? In four and a half columns of verbiage the *Times* writer has failed, we don't say to solve, but even to envisage this problem. How different is his ideal from the system which was the ideal of the Church of Christ and which would have been realized if the Reformation had not broken up the unity of Christendom and destroyed that universal deference to the judgment and authority of the Holy See on which it rested.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

Spa and Disarmament.

The first international Conference since the war, that at Spa, which Germans as well as Allies attended, has not done much as yet to further peace. The Germans yield but only under pressure: sign but are not sanguine about the effect of their signatures. About the question of Disarmament the Allies were firm, although they allowed an extension of the time during which the German Republic of some sixty million people has to reduce its effective army to about 100,000 men with equipment to match, and to hand over to the Allies its surplus war-material. If Germany remains permanently content with an army of 100,000 men, then beyond any doubt the world is safe from any future aggression from that quarter. But no sane person believes that, in the midst of an armed Europe, backing its commercial and political campaigns all the world over by its ability to attack or defend, Germany will remain so content. The comparative readiness with which the German delegates acquiesced in the enforcement of a provision which, under present world-conditions, would handicap them in all international relations, betokens their sense of its futility. They know that anything like a real disarmament can only be brought about if it is a matter of international agreement. They know that their rivals must also reduce their armies ultimately to police-forces, or allow, because they cannot in justice prevent, the Germans to develop defensive strength proportionate to their numbers and national interests. In the meantime, Germany is ready enough to give up weapons which the development of scientific warfare may in any case soon render obsolete, for so long as the Allies do not interfere with Essen and her other war-manufactories, she can easily provide for her future armies. The truth is that until all the nations agree to abandon aggressive warfare, and as a proof of this sincerity deprive themselves of the power of

waging it, they will continue secretly or openly to arm against each other: the power of self-defence is a natural right which can only be abrogated when national security and independence is otherwise guaranteed. Either then a League of all Nations determined to abolish war as the ordinary arbiter of international disputes, or a resumption of the ruinous armament-competition which was one of the causes of the late catastrophe. What the latter alternative means let those shallow thinkers reflect who go about repeating the exploded fallacy that the best security for international peace is national preparation for war. It means that henceforward the highest developments of human skill and industry will be devoted to the destruction, not to the up-building, of civilization; that the old atmosphere of suspicion and distrust will continue to poison international relations; that the evils of secret diplomacy whereby the lives and fortunes of multitudes are at the mercy of a few unprincipled schemers will be perpetuated and intensified. The whole tension in Europe to-day is due to the persistence of the spirit of war in all the peace negotiations, the purpose to assert by force rights which are either doubtful, and therefore matters for judicial arbitration, or which cannot in the circumstances be exacted, and should therefore be abandoned.

**Settlement
of the
Coal-indemnity.**

No one can doubt, for instance, that Germany owes reparation to France and Belgium for the wanton destruction of industries, factories, coal-mines, and the like perpetrated in those countries by her troops during the war, for it was done, according to the un-Christian code that dictated her war activities, with a view of crippling those commercial rivals when war was over. The Peace Treaty stipulated that Germany should deliver to the Allies 3,250,000 tons of coal a month to make good that damage, as part of the general indemnity levied upon her; actually she has sent 1,100,000 tons monthly, alleging that her miners cannot or will not do more, and that she cannot compel them. Knowing our own miners, that is a plea of which we can feel the force. Any attempt to compel the worker by the threat of penalties, physical or otherwise, to increase production must nowadays, outside convict prisons, necessarily fail. Compulsion can only be applied to a relatively small by a relatively large number of people. German workers will labour to pay off the indemnities, by providing coal or other services, only if they are shown that it is their interest to do so. The Allies have recognized these facts, so far as to reduce the monthly subsidy of coal to 2,000,000 tons and to reckon the price of it at market, not pit-head, rates, so that it will represent much more of the indemnity than it otherwise would. These are important modifications which, coupled with M. Millerand's declaration that the Allies have no thought of punishing Germany, whom they

look upon as a necessary and useful member of the European family, and mean to treat loyally and liberally provided she is faithful to her word, should go far to produce a more peaceful atmosphere in future negotiations. We hope that it will be finally recognized that, psychologically, a nation cannot be forced to repent: repentance follows intellectual conviction of wrongdoing, and force belongs to another and a lower plane. When a more enlightened public conscience condemns as essentially immoral the doctrine crystallized into the phrase "Might is Right," and when the militarists of every nation who profess it are publicly disowned and discredited as criminals, then there will be a greater chance of the German aggression of 1914 being reckoned by Germans as an outrage against international justice, however naturally they may seek to palliate it by citing examples of similar outrages on the part of the Allies.

**Recrudescence
of
Militarist Theory.**

Meanwhile the militarists, and the unthinking journalists who echo them, are more and more openly discussing "the next war," so hard is it for the professional mind to look beyond its profession and to consider higher interests. The notorious Bernhardt, in his recent *Vom Kriege der Zukunft*, is already evolving schemes of revenge based upon the secret building of innumerable U-boats, and the secret training of a colossal army and all sorts of similar treaty-breaking. He speaks of course only for himself, and no doubt the bulk of his countrymen would disown his poisonous projects, but he is the type of a clique, which, in spite of the socialist revolution, still has influence in Germany, or, at any rate, in Prussia, and his immoral utterances may do harm in perpetuating the belief in Germany's radical untrustworthiness and so retarding European peace. Bernhardt is undoubtedly the worst of a bad type, but his imbecile chauvinism does not excuse those many other military men amongst the Allies who, with more discretion of utterance but with as little of the spirit of Christianity, proclaim the inevitability of future war, or of those "philosophers" who, by denying the extension of the moral order to organized States, sow the seeds of such conflict. A *Times* reviewer calls shocked attention to the Prussianism which Dr. Bosanquet, even after the revelations of the war, allows to remain in his *Philosophical Theory of the State*.¹

He actually writes "Moral relations presuppose an organized life; but such a life is only within the State, not in relations between the State and other communities," after which it is not surprising to find him, in his introduction to the present edition, stating that the cause of the Italian unity justified the self-confessed villainies of Cavour. Would this seem so certain to Dr. Bosanquet if instead of Cavour, it were a question of Bismarck or Bethmann Hollveg?

¹ Review of Third Edition, *Times Literary Supplement*, May 27, 1920, p. 328.

Dr. Bosanquet is one of that innumerable tribe of After-Christians in every land who, whilst denying the rights of God, set in His place the absolute State and expose mankind to the ruthless despotism of Cæsar. Whilst "modern thought" tolerates, or even applauds these wrong-headed theorists, we cannot wonder that fire-eaters like Bernhardi are not ashamed to apply their theories to practical affairs.

**Either a League
of Nations
or the Red
International.**

But we are convinced that Bernhardi, who wants some "heaven-born leader" [*we* should not look for him in Heaven] to coerce "the common people" into giving its whole heart to purposes of revenge, is out of date. The common people are going at last to use their common sense, and, finding that wars are arranged without their knowledge or consent, and that they are sent forth to die in thousands for quarrels which they do not understand and from which, even if they emerge victorious, they do not necessarily reap any proportionate benefit, are showing signs of their intention not to engage any longer in war or war-like preparations as a matter of course. We called attention last month to the probable effect of the Premier's taunt that it was illogical for the workers to make munitions and then refuse to transport them. That effect has duly followed, and at the Special Trade Union Conference, which met at Scarborough on July 13th, the Miners' Federation carried a resolution demanding, amongst other things, "the cessation of the production of munitions of war destined to be used against Ireland and Russia." Mr. Hodges, who moved this resolution, showed that the Premier's argument had impressed him. "The military machine," he said, "depends for its existence on industrial power. If you workers say you will not produce for it, you can influence its movements and character very much indeed." It would be easy to attach too much importance to such declarations and resolutions, which have their echo in a telegram from Melbourne, dated July 6th, reporting the decision of the Australian Federated Seamen's Union to suggest to all similar organizations the discussion of a common policy, viz., to render war impossible by the simple expedient of refusing to man the ships. But they show, at any rate, the existence and growth of a feeling amongst "common folk," that it is the business of the fighters and the sufferers to decide whether war shall be or not, and not the business of irresponsible diplomatists or army-chiefs, still less of traders and financiers. With this feeling wise Statesmen will reckon; on this feeling, properly guided and educated, the League of Nations for the World's Peace must ultimately base itself. If it is not brought by the efforts of Christians into harmony with the Christian ideals of justice, it will degenerate into the union of the world's workers not to end war, but to make war on those who

employ them. The Red International is the only alternative to a Christianized League of Nations.

**Need of
Catholic Social
Study.**

How much of the social unrest, the worst fruit of which is this arraying of class against class in a sordid contest for material goods, is due to the evil passions of envy and contempt, and how much to the ineradicable desire, natural to man, for justice and fair dealing, cannot of course be determined, but in proportion as the outlook of the combatants is confined to this earth will they tend to be wrong in their spirit and methods. Only by moral and religious influences can the quarrel be solved and the parties reconciled, for religion alone can define the force and limits of natural justice, and counsel that moderation in urging personal rights which is necessary for their successful adjustment. Religion alone can assert the supreme value of the individual human soul, and therefore the evil of social conditions which ignore and nullify that value. Here is the test of what is tolerable and what is intolerable in those conditions. The irresponsible possession of immense wealth is as notoriously bad for the soul as are poverty and all its concomitants. But the innumerable writings on the social question which pour from the press show very little trace of the application of this criterium. Neither those who uphold nor those who denounce capitalism really go to the root of the matter, so long as they do not discuss if the system is compatible with man's essential rights, the chief of which are such life-conditions as do not make the fulfilment of his destiny too difficult. Catholic economists never fail to make this their standard, for they know that there are no dealings between man and man which do not involve justice, and justice is the recognition of rights. But there is need of a more insistent and detailed examination of the justice, not only of the present industrial system, but of the various schemes that are suggested to replace it: hence the great and far-reaching importance of that "Social Week" at Oxford, of which some account is given in this issue, and which had for main object the examination of the causes of social unrest by theorists and practical men working together. Only so can Catholic forces be successfully mobilized for the task incessantly urged upon them by Pope after Pope—the "re-baptizing" of that civilization which the Church created but which in these latter ages has become apostate. Clearly the most important thing to settle is whether the Capitalist system, admittedly the source of many social evils, as well as of certain advantages, can be wholly purged of what is un-Christian in it, or whether its evils are really inherent in it and its advantages can be otherwise secured. To preach reform when revolution is necessary, or *vice versa*, is at the lowest a waste of time.

**Civil and
Ecclesiastical
Censorship.**

It used to be customary, and indeed still is, to denounce the Church for unduly fettering the expression of opinion, and thus checking intellectual development. Her anathematizing of heresy, her prohibition of bad literature, her insistence on censoring what purports to be Catholic teaching—all the natural result of her claim to be the guardian of revealed truth—are held up to scorn as outrages on human freedom. Yet first of all owing to the exigencies of war, and now in the supposed interests of peace, the States engaged in the world-conflict have shackled the expression of opinion in far more drastic fashion than the Church has ever done. And, what the Church never did, by means of the partizan press and otherwise, they have constantly misled public opinion, so that no prudent person ever supposes that he gets the full truth from any Government communication. There never was an obscurantist like your modern State, and the exploits of "Dora" have made her twin-sister to "Duessa." Of a piece with their dread of the effects of truth is their fear of the effects of lying. There is no enemy that causes more apprehension than literary propaganda. Any untoward disturbance anywhere, literally from China to Peru, is confidently ascribed to the deadly literature of Bolshevism. Considering the difficulty of moulding public opinion by means of the public press, as seen in the various "lost causes" which *The Times* (to take one example) has with astonishing literary skill and persistence successively advocated, the secret propaganda of Bolshevism seems to be singularly persuasive, and one is tempted to think that this literature, which is never produced in evidence, is a journalistic figment, designed to cover a certain unwillingness to recognize the true causes of unrest. Anyhow, with the unlimited resources at their disposal, organized States should be able, by disseminating the truth, to counteract whatever is false in such propaganda. It is right that the spreading of doctrines subversive of morality should not be tolerated, and the State might do more, for instance, than it does to suppress the teaching of the neo-Malthusians, but its tendency is to compound for ethical laxity by the severity with which it suppresses legitimate criticism. The licence of the press is an abuse of liberty, but equally so is the subjection of the press to the dictation of the Government of the moment. After all, what the Church aims at safeguarding by her censorship is truth, whilst the civil power uses the same weapon only to preserve its own existence which is not necessarily a good thing.

**Renewal
of Orange
Bigotry.**

It is satisfactory that the 12th of July, the anniversary of the Battle of the Boyne, the day selected by the strange mentality of the Orangeman to revive impressions of religious rancour which in civilized communities are considered detri-

mental to public peace, passed without serious disturbance in the North of Ireland.¹ It is not so satisfactory that the responsible leaders of the Orangemen devoted much of their eloquence on that day to denouncing the Catholic Church, and that even those English papers which proclaim the wantonness of this annual exhibition of bigotry, do not stigmatize as they should the conduct of those politicians who deliberately use this means of inflaming political quarrels. As we have often pointed out, the barrier between the majority in N.E. Ulster and the rest of Ireland is mainly an artificial one. These annual speeches and drum-beatings enter into the education of the Orange child, who is taught to curse the Pope as soon as he can lisp, and to regard the faith of the majority of his fellow-countrymen with fear and contempt. It is not the child's fault if he grows up a surly bigot, but the fault of those presumably educated political and religious leaders, who so pervert his mind. There is no provocation on the Catholic side. No one is vilified from Catholic pulpit or platform because of his religion: the head of no religious society is selected to be the object of indecent abuse. "The Orangeman," said *The Times* on the occasion—we quote from memory—"expects a certain kind of harangue on July 12th, and the politicians give it to him. But nobody really means what is said." We wish that it were so, but, even if it were, where is the sense, the morality, the patriotism, of this periodical stirring up of religious strife, when religion and civil interests alike demand peace and union? It deserves the reprobation of all men and women, who love the Christian name and detest the endeavours made by political interests to use it as a screen.

**Murders
in
Ireland.**

There is no parade of Christianity in the murderous warfare that is being waged against the police in Ireland by certain secret organizations, out of control alike of Church or State.

In vain have Cardinal Logue and other Bishops denounced the bloodshed, and the subterfuges by which misguided men seek to justify it. Nearly every day brings its record of the assassination of constabulary and of regrettable reprisals on the part of military and police. Once a vendetta of that sort is started in a country where the ordinary law cannot be enforced, a kind of perverse logic carries it on. Yet it is elementary ethics that no good cause can be furthered by atrocity. We are bidden, whatever our aims, to seek first the Kingdom of God and His justice. It is useless to say in excuse that Ireland is in "a state of war." The very phrase is characteristic of the loose thinking that has replaced the clear teaching of the Church. A

¹ The Anti-Catholic pogrom in Belfast, which is the natural sequel of the Orange harangues, and has occurred since the above was written, unhappily shows it to have been too optimistic.

state of war exists between two powers after due declaration by those that represent them, and it is justified only as a last resource for the gaining of benefits far greater than the evils which it introduces. The murder-gangs in Ireland, whatever be the provocation they allege, have not, and cannot have, the authorization of the Irish people to reply by assassination. We see no clear issue to all this deplorable business. The Government is forcibly feeble, and, in its weakness, has resorted to the expedient of making the public at large suffer for the doings of a section. Traffic is grievously impeded, public business disorganized, and the "tourist industry" is brought to a standstill, whilst the railwaymen and the authorities engage in a childish match of obstinacy. This form of penalizing the community in order to bring pressure to bear upon the real malcontents was a familiar process during the German occupation of Belgium, and goes indeed some way towards establishing the existence of a state of war, but it assumes, quite unjustifiably as far as we have been able to judge, that the penalized public sympathize with crime. Well may we join in the prayers to Blessed Oliver Plunket, commended by our Hierarchy, on Sunday, July 11th, that some means may be found to bring to an end a spectacle which, from whatever aspect, shocks the sense of Christendom.

**The Tax
on
Holiday-makers.**

One need not be supposed to sympathize with all the attacks on the Government, dictated as many of them are by the large financial interests, if one expresses amazement at their singular inability to foresee the effects of some of their proposals. They knew well enough that industry, the money-making machine, would protest loudly against being crippled by heavy taxation. It is time that industry, and, indeed, all classes of the community, realized that you cannot nowadays wage even a successful war without being crippled for generations. The burden is there to be shouldered by the State as a whole, and the task of the Government is so to adjust it that no section escapes its due share. So the Chancellor maintains his excess profits tax, the main objection to which is that the merchant sooner or later passes it on to the consumer in the shape of increased prices. But the Government seem to be really blind to the effects of their measures in the taxation imposed upon means of communication, the bonds which produce and preserve the oneness of the community. By the enormous increase of postal charges, they have not only impeded social intercourse, but have ignored the teaching of history, which shows that the way to increase postal revenues is to *lower* the rates. This, however, is a minor imprudence compared with the proposal to increase, by 100 per cent over the pre-war rates, passenger fares on railways at the beginning of the chief holiday season. The

protest of "industry" against the E.P.D. is likely to prove mildness itself compared with the storm of indignation arising from the bulk of the public at this tactless proposal. In consequence, it will probably be deferred till later in the season, although the result will be that more must be raised from the taxpayer to pay the railway subsidy. The whole question of cheapness of communication is so vital to the welfare of the community that our wasteful railway system must, sooner or later, be reformed. Transport is a necessary public service which is particularly ill-adapted to exploitation by private owners. Yet nationalization, as the Post Office shows, is no guarantee of economy. A combination, such as the Minister of Transport suggests, between private enterprise and public control, would possibly eliminate some of the evils of both.

Agnostic Criticism.

Nothing is more conspicuous in current non-Catholic criticism of philosophy and literature than the entire tacit abandonment of the gift of Christian revelation, that is to say, of the sure grasp of absolute truth conferred by the divine intervention in the history of the world by means of the Incarnation. Instead of saying—"Here is God's gift of assured truth designed to direct and supplement human reason, and therefore all canons of criticism or intellectual speculations must conform to it or be wholly wrong"—the modern mind ignores revelation altogether, and, lacking a standard of reference, involves itself in a mist of words which serve at least to hide its grosser self-contradictions. Abundant evidence of this may be found in that foremost organ of criticism of the day, *The Times Literary Supplement*, the writers in which are exceptionally cultured and well-informed, but almost invariably handicapped by absence of a fixed and consistent religious philosophy. In other words, as they have no clear views on the most fundamental questions of all—God's existence and nature, and man's purpose in creation—they cannot adequately discuss the varied speculations which bear upon these questions. An essay in the issue of June 10th, for instance, on the "Idea of Progress," takes recent works on that topic by Professor Bury, a rationalist, and Dean Inge, a neo-Platonist, as material for debate, yet does not point out that neither the Professor nor the Dean has any true notion of what "progress" is, since neither know the starting-point or the goal. This is apparently true of the reviewer himself who totally ignores Christ's teaching as a mode or source of knowledge. Similarly, a recent review of Mr. Wells' *Outline of History* does not venture to say whether that distinguished author is right or wrong in his view-point or conclusions.

The upshot is that the non-Catholic world has become practically agnostic and ceased to be in any sense a trustworthy guide to thought. It behoves Catholics, therefore, to redouble their

efforts to put before a wandering yet truth-seeking generation the clear, consistent, eminently reasonable life-philosophy of the Catholic Church in a fashion which takes account of the ignorance and pre-suppositions of the age. Reconstruction herein is even more necessary than the upbuilding of our material civilization, for here the ruin is greater and of longer date.

THE EDITOR.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Blessed Oliver Plunkett [Shane Leslie and Dom Ethelbert Horne, O.S.B., in *Dublin Review*, July, 1920, p. 1].

Catholic Literature as a World-force [George Schuster in *Catholic World*, July, 1920, p. 454].

Enthusiasms of Youth in the Higher Schools, The [St. V. Dunin-Borkowski in *Stimmen*, July, 1920, p. 299].

Europe's Spiritual Distress [A. J. Muench in *America*, July 3, 1920, p. 245].

L'Idéal monastique au moyen age [J. Dutillant in *Etudes*, July 20, 1920, p. 129].

Les Martyres récemment beatifiées [Paul Duden in *Etudes*, July 5, 1920, p. 5].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Christian Doctrine of Atonement, The [T. B. Strong, D.D., Bishop-Designate of Carlisle, in *Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1920, p. 219].

From Linnæus to Haeckel [Eric Wasmann in *Stimmen*, July, 1920, p. 299].

Marx or Proudhon [H. du Passage in *Etudes*, July 5, 1920, p. 25].

Renouveau et nouvelle révolution en Mexique [J. Boubée in *Etudes*, July 20, 1920, p. 236].

Roman Catholic View of Reunion, A [Dr. A. C. Headlam in *Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1920, p. 289].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Anunzio as a Moral Teacher [Bernard J. Macnamara in *America*, July 3, 1920, p. 247].

"And such like Fooleries" [Bede Jarrett, O.P., in *Blackfriars*, July, 1920, p. 196].

Ecclesiastical Parasites [John A. Vaughan, S.J., in *America*, July 3, 1920, p. 249].

Eine neue Keilschriftart [A. Deimel in *Orientalia*, Inst. Bibl., No. 1, 1920, p. 56].

Father Gerard Hopkins: his Personality and Work [*Dublin Review*, July, 1920, p. 40].

La vita di Antonio Fogazzaro sec. Gallarati Scottie [*Civiltà Cattolica*, July 3, 1920, p. 64].

Letter to the Russian Rulers, 1908, A [Patriarch Tryphon in *Christian East*, June, 1920, p. 98].

Mexique, Renouveau catholique [J. Boubée in *Etudes*, July 5, 1920, p. 101].

Nuova parola del Papa per la pacificazione sociale, La [*Civiltà Cattolica*, July 3, 1920, p. 8].

P. Johann Nepomuk Strassmaier, S.J. [A. Deimel in *Orientalia*, Inst. Bibl., No. 1, 1920, p. 1].

Reality of Psycho-physical Phenomena, The [H. Thurston, S.J., in *Dublin Review*, July, 1920, p. 94].

Verso Roma [A. Portaluppi in *La Scuola Cattolica*, July, 1920, p. 8].

REVIEWS

I—GALLICANISM AND CATHOLIC REFORM.¹

THE Council of Trent had two tasks before it to accomplish, one of doctrinal definition, the other of disciplinary decrees. In spite of the difficulties and opposition which confronted it on every side, it is generally admitted that it achieved both these objects in a masterly manner. But beyond this work which it accomplished during the time of its sessions, there was the further work of getting its decisions accepted and brought into force. As to its doctrinal definitions this was effected without so much difficulty. It was never really expected that the Protestant party, which had so recently come into existence, would accept dogmas, however lucidly explained and justified, which struck at the very roots of their heresies, but the Catholic-minded of all classes, being led by sound theologians as well as by Church authority, found the Council's luminous expositions eminently convincing, and gratefully accepted them. The disciplinary decrees, however, or reform decrees as they were called, though they were in response to a much-needed outcry which had been persistent in every country since the time of the great schism in the Papacy, and though they met this demand in a remarkably thorough and all-embracing manner, and struck at so many deep-rooted abuses which had gradually crept in and favoured secular ambitions and egotisms, were in fact very hard to carry out, as they found arrayed against their introduction powerful influences set in motion, not only by classes and factions, but even by civil governments. Among the countries where this conflict with the disciplinary legislation of the Council, advocated as it was perseveringly by the Holy See, was particularly strong, was France. And though eventually it was brought into force there, this achievement, according to one canonist of high authority whom this volume cites, was not completely accomplished before the great Revolution. Still the conflict which was thus eventually successful was being carried on steadily all through, and it is M. Victor Martin's purpose to record its

¹ *Le Gallicanisme et la Réforme catholique.* Par Victor Martin. Paris : Picard. Pp. xxvii. 415. Price, 20 fr. 1919.

history, a task for which he was well qualified as a canonist of high repute, who has, moreover, had the advantage of living for a long time in Rome with easy access to the archives of the Vatican and other Roman collections, especially those of the French Nunciature. These have enabled him, as he says, "to search the numerous registers of the epoch under consideration, and particularly the almost daily correspondence of the Nuncios with the Secretaries of State," and with their aid, to follow step by step the long and laborious negotiations changing in their shades of character with the changing hands of those who conducted them.

In his Introduction, M. Martin gives a summary account of the points of reform which the Council had striven to effect. For instance, the Council laid it down as an axiom that there should be a just proportion between an ecclesiastical benefice and the charge which its holder should be required to administer. It sought also, by wise provisions, to control the too prevalent custom of dividing the endowments of the abbeys into two portions, one commendatory, which it was the custom of the crown or rich patrons to give over to laymen, usually members of their own families, another much less lavish, which was given to those who were entrusted with the actual government of the religious communities. Other provisions aimed at securing that those who were admitted to the ecclesiastical state showed signs of real vocation, or again, were constrained to pass through a suitable system of ecclesiastical education in seminaries, where they would come under powerful spiritual influences. There were other provisions which the Council enacted of which those mentioned are types and examples, and when one considers them all as laid down in the *acta*, one cannot but feel how wholesome they are, and how, to confine ourselves to the Church of France, they were such as were calculated to repress the abuses which French ecclesiastical history fixes on as the grave blots on a system otherwise so meritorious. There were also other abuses, even affecting the Papal Court, which the Council did not hesitate to repress by suitable enactments. Of course the Council could not bind the Popes, but they had the Popes with them, solicitous to see that these provisions were carried out, with the result that the Popes from that time forward became a fine succession of truly spiritual rulers.

To return to France, at the time when the Council of Trent

was dissolved, the country was in a state of confusion, and Catherine de Medici, in her short-sightedness, was only anxious to coquet in accordance with their wishes with the Huguenot Party by encouraging a settlement at the expense of Catholic doctrines and laws, so that for the time being nothing in the way of State support for the reform legislation could be hoped for. Under Henry III. and Henry IV. the Crown was more favourably inclined, but it began to appear that the real obstructors of the publication of the Council's decrees in France were the *Parlementaires*. These, apart from some few whose religious faith was stronger than their political inclinations, were the consistent opponents of the Holy See at all times, and M. Martin's conclusion is that it was they who were the stubborn opponents all through of the introduction into the kingdom of the reforms of Trent; indeed, that the anti-Christian policy of recent French Governments is but an inheritance bequeathed to them by the pre-revolutionary *Parlementaires*.

At the same time, some good came out of the evil thus caused by the Parliamentary opposition, for as M. Martin notes, it forced the French hierarchy to reflect more carefully on their own intrinsic power to determine and set in motion ecclesiastical legislation without reference to the State usurpations which had previously established themselves. The most solemn expression of this resolution of the Bishops to take on themselves the responsibility for the publication of the Council in France was at the General Assembly in 1615, when the members of the Assembly signed the minute of the publication by an imposing majority, in which they all pledged themselves, by the use of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction, to see that their resolution was carried into effect. The Parliament protested and threatened to withdraw their revenues. But the Court and the conscience of the whole kingdom was against them, and they were enabled to secure that the decrees of the Council should pass into the general custom of the realm; and though opposition was offered, and the laws accepted were not unfrequently violated, the victory was at last practically won.

The reader can gather from this summary what an abundance of excellent work of a truly historical character has been provided for the student by this work of M. Victor Martin's.

2—THE PROBLEM OF EVIL¹

THE *Problem of Evil* is a problem which has often been discussed, and for long will continue to be discussed, by writers approaching it from various standpoints. The Rev. Peter Green, an Anglican Canon of Manchester, in the little volume lying before us for review, discusses it in a thoroughly Christian spirit, and makes some very good points, though in some others he is less successful, having no sound tradition or philosophy to guide him. He makes the right distinction in regard to the nature of Omnipotence. It does not imply that God is not subject to the law of contradiction for, as he truly says, were He such He would cease to be a possible object of human thought. He deduces, too, quite soundly from this principle, that for God to *make* a man *choose* good is impossible, if by the term we are to mean that a choice so made can be an act having a moral value. Still here he shows that he has not worked out the point with the thoroughness with which it has been worked out by the Catholic theologians in their discussions on the conditions of efficient grace. On the other hand, he makes, or rather calls attention to, an important consideration when he reminds his readers that, in deciding what shall be his choice, a man lays before himself a set of *ideal* ends or aims, the number of which it is possible for him to multiply indefinitely, as he is also able freely to give increased weight and value to some ends and decreased weight and value to others.

In dealing with the Fall he runs off into extravagance by trusting to his imagination rather than to any indications that can be gathered from the message of the Christian revelations. Under this influence he starts a theory in the truth of which he expresses much confidence, but which we are compelled to say that there is nothing solid to favour. He assures us that he has long been convinced that any theory to be tenable must fulfil two conditions, that man is responsible for his sins (he means even for his original sin), and that, this notwithstanding, the tendency to sin is earlier than any conscious act? When then was a fall of this kind perpetrated? Here he accepts, what is hopeless from an orthodox point of view, the position that modern science knows nothing of a fallen, but rather of an ascended, man. On

¹ By Peter Green, M.A., Canon of Manchester. London: Longmans. Pp. viii. 205. Price, 6s. net. 1920.

this basis he fixes on a time when, in the course of its evolution from a purely animal condition, man had arrived at the dawn of self-consciousness and of a moral sense. The soul then, on its awakening, finds itself bound up with and responsible for a body with strong desires and passions; and being as yet weak itself oftentimes is defeated into giving consent to their fierce temptations, and so sins. The term "oftentimes" implies that different souls engage in this struggle with the flesh with differing results, and that is the author's view. How then does his theory save the unity of original sin? It does so by contending that to each individual only a part or aspect of humanity is granted, so that to get it in its completeness the many individuals must be regarded as one, and the sin which brought ruin on the race is inferred to have been an act of self-seeking on the part of these contributory individuals by which they introduced discord into their being, whereas had they, after the pattern of the persons in the Trinity, acted each for the interest of all, they would have been saved from the Fall, and God, who under present conditions, allows physical evil to rage so extensively throughout the world that it may be a suitable *habitat* for a fallen race, would in His goodness have seen to it that the character of the world should be changed till it became a meet dwelling-place for an unfallen race. This curious theory is not likely, we imagine, to gain many adherents, but Canon Green writes of it in a nice Christian spirit which wins our sympathy.

As for the doctrine of Original Sin itself, we must repeat what we said of it in this periodical last August. No conception of its nature is tenable which involves that by the Fall, Adam deprived himself and his posterity of any endowment which was essential to the due working of the nature they have each and all received from God. But if we postulate, as there is much in the New Testament to justify our postulating, that beyond his gifts of pure nature, man also received in Adam an altogether higher class of endowments which raised him to the supernatural state, and that it was these he lost through the Fall for himself and his descendants, the Catholic doctrine, as laid down by St. Paul, becomes intelligible, and in conformity with the whole teaching of the Church about God's justice and man's redemption.

3—THE WORCESTER "LIBER ALBUS."¹

THIS is a selection of papers from the *Liber Albus*, so called from its white binding, which in former times belonged to the Prior and convent of the Cathedral Priory of Worcester, but at the suppression of this corporation, at the time of the Reformation, passed into the hands of the Dean and Chapter of that cathedral. The selection is edited by Canon James M. Wilson, a veteran now well on in his eighties, whose reputation for studies of this sort, as for many others, is well-established. The present Bishop of Worcester, as one of the Canon's old pupils, writes a short preface in the spirit of filial gratitude towards one to whom he owes much.

In an Introduction, Canon Wilson draws a comparison between this Worcester *Liber Albus* and the *Literæ Cantuarienses*, edited by Dr. Sheppard for the Rolls Series in 1887, a kindred selection of letters, and other documents which illustrate the varied activity of another Cathedral Prior, for both books are books in which the monastic chancellor records the documents which attest or recount the monastic Superior's business transactions, the Worcester book having the advantage over the other in referring to transactions of a somewhat earlier date, namely, from A.D. 1301 to A.D. 1338.

Needless to say, the facts thus recorded are not of the same kind as one would look for in a chronicle, but while neither of these can dispense with the other, each has its own value, and a *compotus* such as this is valuable for the insights it can give into the character of mediæval life and its methods of Church administration. To take a few illustrations, John de Dumbleton, a monk of the Priory of Worcester, was elected by the connected monastery of Little Malvern to be their Prior, and was accordingly appointed to that office by Bishop Godfrey Giffard, of Worcester. He does not seem to have been a success in that capacity, and two years later resigned and applied to be taken back again into his old community at Worcester. This, under ordinary circumstances, would have been his right, as he belonged to Worcester by his religious profession, but he had renounced this right by a formal document on going to Malvern and the Prior, and the Worcester people evidently did not want him back. Archbishop Winchelsey, at a recent visitation of the Worcester diocese,

¹ By James M. Wilson, D.D. S.P.C.K. Pp. xviii. 284. Price, 15s. net. 1920.

had written, requiring them to submit to his return amongst them, but in Doc. I. of this selection, John de Wyke, the prior-elect, writes back in July, 1301, to the Archbishop, "reverently falling at your fatherly feet, and with heartfelt sobs, pouring out our earnest prayers, and praying that in this matter his paternity would provide for the salvation of many souls which, in the event of an adverse decision, will manifestly be imperilled." Evidently John de Dumbleton, though the author of some learned works on philosophy, was a contentious character, and as the Archbishop threatened the Worcester monks with excommunication in case of non-compliance, they were seriously distressed at the alternative with which they were faced, but they pleaded that they were quite ready to contribute what was necessary for his maintenance elsewhere *ne vagus et profugus deveniret*. They also write to the Abbot of Westminster as the President of their General Provincial Chapter, to whom John de Dumbleton had appealed in the first instance, begging him to assign some other house in which he might abide, and accept from them five marks a year, a sum which a modern reader may think trifling, but which was quite adequate in those days. These various letters afford an opportunity of estimating the foresight of the system by which the Benedictine monasteries were administered.

Doc. 240 gives an instance of what is called Papal provision. Bishop William of Gainsborough, then Bishop of Worcester, writes to his rural dean to say that one William de Staneweye, a poor clerk, writes to him to say that the late Pope Boniface VIII. had written to his predecessor at Worcester, and had ordered that some ecclesiastical benefice in the patronage of the cathedral priory should be given to provide for him, and that the said predecessor had ordered that the next vacant benefice should thus be assigned to him by the Prior and convent. Further, that the petitioner had represented to Bishop William that the living of Overbury was now vacant, and asked the Bishop to induct him into it, and the Bishop instructs the rural dean to summon the said Prior and convent to appear before him or his commissary and state if there is any canonical reason why the Apostolic mandate should not be carried out in this way. The heading sets this down as a case in which the Papal appointment was made without the knowledge of the patrons. This does not seem to have been the case, though even if it was, the Pope

had full power to over-ride the rights of presentation of the patron in any particular case for higher reasons. But we require fuller information to know what the higher reason was.

These are two cases out of many which illustrate the character of mediæval Church life and administration. This selection is published by the S.P.C.K., which means that it is intended to give an ordinarily educated reader an insight into the manner of historical evidence for such facts.

4—MEDIÆVAL ECONOMICS ¹

THE return of ethical notions to economic text-books is characteristic of our day. They may not always be very clear notions, but ethical they undoubtedly are. The Victorian attempt to make economics a cold, exact science as independent of moral standards as are physics and chemistry, appears to have completely collapsed. The time is ripe, therefore, for an exposition of the rules of social justice which regulated the economic life of men before a united Christendom was broken up by the Protestant Revolution. Sir William Ashley has done very much to prepare the way for a better understanding and appreciation of the teaching of the mediæval canonists, and Mr. A. J. Penty is hard at work trying to convince his fellow-Guildsmen that the solution of the social problems of to-day is to be found in the Catholic Middle Ages. Now, in the present volume, Mr. O'Brien, who is a Catholic, presents us with a very useful summary of the views of the Schoolmen on certain outstanding questions which arise in connection with property and its employment in the service of man.

A rather long Introduction deals with the meaning of the terms "mediæval," "economic," and "teaching." As to the first, Mr. O'Brien does not pursue his subject beyond the end of the fifteenth century. No doubt he had to draw the line somewhere, and no doubt he was well-advised to draw it there: but one hopes that he will continue his essay in a future volume, dealing with the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when the great Jesuit jurists (if one may so call them) did so much to elaborate the conception of social justice. Molina, Suarez, Lessius, de Lugo, have much to teach the political philosopher of to-day. As Mr. O'Brien writes of the earlier centuries:

¹ *An Essay on Mediæval Economic Teaching.* By George O'Brien. London: Longmans. Pp. viii. 242. Price, 12s. 6d. net.

It cannot be denied that a study of the principles which were [then] accepted may be of great value to a generation which is striving to place its economic life once more upon an ethical foundation.

The second chapter, on Property, vindicates the Fathers and Schoolmen from the charge of teaching Communism; and, although this has been done before, it is well to have it done again, as the charge is still repeated. The third chapter is perhaps more interesting, dealing, as it does, with the notion of Just Price and the mediæval prohibition of usury. On the question whether the Just Price was subjective or objective, Mr. O'Brien agrees with Father Kelleher (against Father Slater) that it was objective. For ourselves, we feel that the last word has not yet been said on this question, and we should have liked to see a reference in Mr. O'Brien's pages to the valuable work by Alfred de Tarde, *L'Idée du Juste Prix*. But the question is too big to re-open here. The discussion of the prohibition of Usury is lucid, and follows the lines usual in our text-books. It should prove useful to those who still think that the Church impeded the development of commerce. This chapter concludes with a brief account of mediæval monetary theory. A final chapter, by way of conclusion, summarizes the results of the essay.

Mr. O'Brien has made a useful addition to our scanty Catholic literature in English on social ethics. He has read widely, and if he does not go much to original sources he has made good use of secondary authorities, Catholic and Protestant. On pages 78-79 of his book, however, he falls into the trap which awaits all who quote St. Thomas Aquinas. He gives several extracts to prove that the schoolmen did not despise or belittle temporal riches, and amongst them the following from *Contra Gentiles*, iii. c. 131:

The occasions of sin are to be avoided, but poverty is an occasion of evil, because theft, perjury, and flattery are frequently brought about by it. Therefore poverty should not be voluntarily undertaken, but rather avoided.

Now this citation is from a chapter entitled "Arguments of those who attack voluntary poverty." As St. Thomas had taken a vow of poverty, it is obvious that he is not one of those who attack it: and if we turn over a few pages to chapter 134 we find him vindicating voluntary poverty and replying to the objection quoted by Mr. O'Brien:

Since neither wealth nor poverty is good in itself for man, but only in so far as it accords with his true welfare [*secundum quod ordinantur ad bonum rationis*] there is nothing to prevent evil arising out of either of them when they are not used according to right reason. . . . So poverty is not to be rejected on account of evils which accidentally and occasionally arise from it.

The printing and general appearance of the book leave nothing to be desired.

5—SOME BOOKS ON CANON LAW¹

AN advantage which we gain from the New Code of Canon Law is that it enables quite ordinary readers to acquire a solid knowledge of the Church's system of administration without needing to have recourse to the instructions of expert canonists, unless, indeed, where subtle cases occur which need to be referred to the ecclesiastical tribunals. The three books which we have enumerated below are illustrations. The first of them, indeed, namely Mr. Arthur Preuss's third volume of his adapted edition of Dr. Koch's *Handbook of Moral Theology*, the earlier volumes of which we have already noticed at the time of their respective appearances, is not exactly a book on Canon Law, but may be classed with others of that sort on account of the close connection of its subject-matter. It is useful at the present time, as it treats of some practical subjects much talked of, but it avoids case-law as much as possible, being evidently meant rather as a book of instruction for lay-readers. We notice, as an omission, that it passes over the question of the permissibility of the hunger-strike.

Dom Augustine, O.S.B.'s *Commentary on the New Code of Canon Law* enters on its Third Book, which is *De Rebus*. This is another book, the previous volumes of which we have reviewed. In the natural course, Vol. IV. should now follow, but in view of the importance of the marriage cases which are frequently arising, it has been found convenient to issue Vol. V. before Vol. IV., as it is entirely concerned with Marriage. As the system on which this excellent commentary is composed is known from the three volumes already published,

¹ (1) *Handbook of Moral Theology*. Koch—Preuss. Vol. III. Man's Duties to Himself. Pp. 183. 1919. (2) *Commentary on the New Code of Canon Law*. By Charles Augustine, O.S.B., D.D. Book III. Vol. V. Pp. ix. 444. 1919. (3) *Dictionary of Canon Law*. By C. Trudel, S.S. Pp. 242. 1919. All from Herder, St. Louis and London.

we need only say here that the same excellences prevail and make the volume to be one whose clear and practical expositions are sure to make it a success among those particularly whose function it is to deal with marriage cases.

The Dictionary of Canon Law of Fr. Trudel, S.S., is another accession to our Canon Law library, the value of which is obvious. The author calls it a digest of the entire Code, and says of it justly, that "it contains all that the average priest should know, more than our Sisterhoods need to know, and much that will interest the laity on the laws of the Church." All is arranged in the form of a dictionary, that is, each term in its alphabetical sequence, which makes it quite simple to follow.

SHORT NOTICES

MORAL THEOLOGY.

CANON DE SMET'S classic treatise *De Sponsalibus et Matrimonio* (Beyaert, Bruges: 2 Vols.: 30.00 fr.), of which the third edition is before us, made its first appearance in 1909, and so manifestly needed revision in the light of the New Code of Canon Law. It is a work of the highest excellence and utility, comprising all the historical, juridical and moral aspects of its subject. A classified bibliographical index of some thirty pages, which nevertheless excludes mere text-books, shows the immense industry of the author. In these troublous times, when the civil State itself in various countries is leading an assault on the divine institutions of marriage, it behoves the shepherds of the flock to be instant in its defence by the clear promulgation of the true doctrine, such as is herein admirably provided.

The well-known Redemptorist text-book of Moral, the *Theologia Moralis* of Father Jos. Aertys, C.S.S.R. (Teulings: Vol. I.: 7.50 fr.), has reached its tenth edition under the care of Father Damen of the same Congregation, who had already issued the ninth, and brought the whole work into accord with the new Codex. It follows the traditional order of the subject, and is an authoritative exposition of the doctrine of St. Alphonsus.

The Rev. Dr. Ayrinhac, of St. Patrick's Seminary, California, has already published a commentary on the new Marriage Legislation, and now taking the Fifth Book discusses the **Penal Legislation in the New Code of Canon Law** (Benziger: \$3.00 net). Nothing makes one realize more the fact that the Church is God's Kingdom on earth than her penal legislation, supported as it is mainly by moral sanctions. As all may be concerned in this legislation, either as delinquents or administrators, this careful exposition of its scope and meaning will be of interest to all.

BIBLICAL.

In the Old Testament series for schools Dr. T. W. Crafer has edited with introductions and copious notes the **Books of Haggai and Zechariah**

(Cambridge University Press), which pair of contemporary prophets we know as Aggæus and Zacharias.

In the harmony of the Gospel accounts of the events concerning the Resurrection, or rather the discovery of the empty tomb by our Lord's various disciples, which he calls **The First Easter Morning** (S.P.C.K.: 3s. 6d. net), the Rev. N. P. Williams ascribes more to the ignorance and errors of the evangelists than the Catholic doctrine of inspiration allows. The problem really arises from our considering that each sacred writer meant to give a full and connected account of the event. We cannot harmonize them with certainty, because we do not know all the facts: for example, how many groups of women there were: but there are many possible ways of making the narratives consistent with each other. Mr. Williams, though he admits the central miracle of the Resurrection, seems unduly anxious to exclude the miraculous in other respects.

DEVOTIONAL.

With the laudable object of facilitating the intercourse of the creature with the Creator, Dom S. Louismet, O.S.B., continues to issue his devotional series on the art of prayer, the latest, the fourth, volume being entitled **Divine Contemplation for All** (Burns, Oates and Washbourne: 5s. 6d. net). Herein the idea of contemplation is skilfully analysed, and shown, in the wider sense of the author, to be a practice thoroughly natural to man, so that he has merely to make divine things the object of his mind's activities in order to become a "contemplative." How easy this has become, given understanding and good will, owing to the immense variety of ways in which God manifests Himself in Nature and in the Church, the author points out with abundance of apposite illustration, many references to approved authorities and interesting records of his own experience. It cannot fail, by brushing aside imaginary difficulties, greatly to encourage the faithful to practise mental prayer. On page 77 a paragraph is left unfinished, and we wonder whether the book recommended on p. 142 as Sir B. Windle's "Key to Civilization," should not rather be "The Key to the World's Progress," by C. S. Devas.

The conditions of life, however ameliorated, will always provide occasions for the exercise of almsgiving, or the practice of self-sacrifice for the neighbour's sake. How that necessary virtue should be put into operation is the subject of an illuminating little study by M. S. de Galard Béarn, called **Le Pauvre** (Beauchesne: 1.50 fr.), which is practically a disquisition on the text *Beatus qui intelligit super egenum et pauperem*.

With the laudable purpose of raising men's minds "to heavenly desires," Alice E. Peacock, M.B.E., in **The Delightful Joys of Heaven** (S.P.C.K.: 6s. 6d. net), endeavours to give form and substance to what St. Paul found indescribable, so that the contents of our hope should be solid and permanent, not a series of mere negations. She imagines the various sources of earthly joy corresponding to the uses of our senses and faculties, and sublimates them, finding corroboration for her views in a literal interpretation of various Scripture passages. It is not a little fanciful and not at all philosophical, but it will certainly serve to colour and stimulate those whose imaginations are too much sunk in things of earth.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

The narrative of the short life of Dom Pie de Hemptinne, O.S.B., who lived only 27 years, ten of which he spent in the cloister, has been issued in a third, slightly condensed, edition under the same title, *Une Ame Bénédictine* (Abbaye de Maredsous: 4.50 fr.), and shows how welcome has been to the devotion of the faithful this practical exhibition of the Benedictine spirit. It is an "interior life" in the fullest sense, more than a third of it consisting of his spiritual writings and correspondence.

That charming spiritual biography in the guise of fiction in which "John Ayscough" tells of his childhood and youth, and gradual emergence from the mists of Anglicanism into the sunshine of the faith, has been issued in a new and cheaper edition—*Fernando* (Long: 4s. 6d. net)—which will, we trust, carry its fresh and most persuasive apologetic into ever wider circles.

There is no lack of books to tell us of the heroic deeds of French soldiers in the great war, but hitherto no account has reached us of the heroism, no less pronounced and sustained, of that army of French women which at home and in every theatre of war was mobilized for the care and service of the wounded. The narrative of a life spent in social service, ending in death through sickness whilst on hospital duty in Rumania, is set forth for us by Mme. Marthe Amalbert in her biography of *Geneviève Hennet de Goutel* (Beauchesne: 7.00 fr. net). This young French girl, after a phase of scepticism, was already wholly exercised in good works, inspired in her case by the high ideals of "Le Sillon," particularly to the care of the sick poor, when war broke out, and her devotion to her neighbour, fed by a profound love of God, found an immediate outlet in succouring the wounded. Her letters and diaries display a character of singular charm, endowed with many natural gifts, highly cultivated yet remaining thoroughly unworldly.

BOOKS FOR STUDENTS.

Tertullian against Praxeas (S.P.C.K.: 5s. net), translated with notes and Introduction by Dr. A. Souter, is one of the African Doctor's writings after he became a Montanist, but as it is a vigorous defence of the Trinity it contains no trace of his specific heresies. We are glad to see that Dr. Souter has gone to a Catholic theologian, Father d'Alés, S.J., for the elucidation of theological points.

The Rev. Dr. B. J. Kidd, who is engaged in writing a history of the Early Church, has published a first selection of *Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church to A.D. 313* (S.P.C.K.: 7s. 6d. net) mainly from the Greek and Latin Fathers. There are 225 extracts in all, translated by various scholars and arranged with dates and references, and as a whole they give clear witness both to the stability and to the development of doctrine in the Church.

POETRY.

With the double object of showing the Greek Church that the Anglican, despite the heterodoxy of some of her members, is not afraid of paying unique honour to the Mother of God, and of showing Anglicans that the Greek Church does not honour her too much, the Rev. G. R. Woodward, M.A., has translated into English verse, and suggested suitable music for, 136 out of the thousands of Theotokia which are contained

in the Greek Service Books, and arranged them to follow the yearly feasts of Our Lady and to commemorate the incidents of Christ's early life. Considering the difficulty of hymn-writing in general, and of translating hymns in particular, the enterprise is singularly successful, and under the title **The Most Holy Mother of God** (Faith Press: 6s. net), and most tastefully bound in shades of blue, we hope the book will do its share in restoring Christian unity.

FICTION.

A series of sketches of clerical life in the States, called **Father Ladden, Curate** (Magnificat Press: \$1.00), by L. M. Whalen, introduces one into very pleasant and edifying company. The episodes concerning the difficulties and consolations of parish work are portrayed by a keen and sympathetic observer.

MISCELLANEOUS.

In May last year we had occasion to criticize adversely a new scheme of education, called by its authors *The Spiritual Foundations of Reconstruction*, principally on the ground that the plan necessitated "undenominationalism." That was enough to condemn it in Catholic eyes, however carefully elaborated and consistently devised. From others it seems to have received a certain measure of support, judging from the fact that one of its authors, Dr. F. H. Hayward, has since published two supplementary volumes, **A First, and Second Book of School Celebrations** (King and Son: 5s.; price of 2nd not stated). Granting Dr. Hayward's underlying assumption that a clear and certain ethical standard can be inculcated by means of a species of hero-worship, and that an unemotional, inartistic, unimaginative people can be trained to think aright and to give public vent to their impressions, through the medium of art and oratory, his examples and suggestions seem to be admirably chosen, and they are worked out with a careful attention to detail, indicative of zealous conviction.

An American firm, "The Magnificat Publishing Co.", Manchester, N.H., have issued at \$1.00, in a neatly got-up volume, Mrs. Armel O'Connor's inspiring little book, **A Girl's Ideals**, and combined with it two shorter essays, by the Rev. W. Kitchin and the Rev. P. J. Scott respectively, on the same subject.

A sort of "Enquire-within-upon-everything," called **Recettes Domestiques et Rurales**, is issued at 3 francs by La Bonne Presse, of Paris, and contains from three to four hundred handy bits of information on all kinds of household matters, mainly culinary and horticultural.

The fiftieth anniversary of the death of Montalembert having occurred last March, M. Victor Bucaille has taken occasion of the event to issue a memorial volume, called **Pages Choiesies de Montalembert** (Gabalda: 7.00 fr. net). Known in England chiefly as the author of the great historical studies *St. Elizabeth of Hungary* and *The Monks of the West*, Montalembert is here shown as a foremost Catholic publicist, contending in Parliament and the press for Christian education, for the rights of the working poor, for the rights of the Church, for Catholic culture generally. Some important letters are herein published for the first time, and the book is aptly introduced by M. Georges Goyau.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

BENZIGER, New York.

The Foundations of True Morality.
By T. Slater, S.J. Pp. 88. Price,
\$1.25 net. *Talks to Nurses.* By
H. J. Spalding, S.J. Pp. 197.
Price, \$1.50 net.

BROWNE & NOLAN, Dublin.

*St. Bernard on the Canticle of Can-
ticles.* Translated by a Priest of
Mount Melleray. Vol. I. Pp.
xiii. 497. Price, 9s. net.

**BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE,
London.**

The Catholic Doctrine of Grace. By
George Joyce, S.J. Pp. xiv. 267.
Price, 6s. net.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

Space Time and Gravitation. By
A. S. Eddington. Pp. vi. 218.
Price, 15s. net. *The Treatment
of the Remains of the Eucharist.*
By W. Lockton. Pp. vii. 280.
Price, 20s. net.

THE DEVIN ADAIR CO., New York.

Moods and Memories. By Edmund
Leamy. Pp. 149. Price, \$2.00.

ERNEST LEROUX, Paris.

*Le Conflit du Christianisme primitif
et de la Civilisation.* By Prof. A.
Causse. Pp. 77.

GILL & SON, Dublin.

The Divine Office. By Rev. E. J.
Quigley. Pp. xii. 288. Price,
7s. 6d. net.

HARDING & MORE, London.

Crucible Island. By Conde Pollen.
Pp. 215. Price, 6s.

HERDER, London.

The Passion and Glory of Christ. By
Mgr. F. X. Poetze, S.T.D. Trans-
lated by A. M. Buchanan. Edited
by Fr. Martindale, S.J. Pp.
viii. 371. Price, 14s. n. *Compen-
dium Theologiae Moralis.* By Frs.
Sabetti and Barrett, S.J. 28th
Edit. Pp. 1233. Price, £1 7s. 6d.
net. *Short Sermons for Sundays.*
By J. R. Newell, O.P., P.G.
Pp. 176. Price, 7s. net. *Religion,
Faith and the Church.* By Canon
Einig, D.D. Pp. 158. Price,
7s. net. *Sunday School Sermon-
ettes.* By Canon J. S. Richter.
Pp. 430. Price, 10s. 6d. net.

METHUEN, London.

"Gentlemen—The King!" By John
Oxenham. Pp. 96. Price, 2s. n.

S.P.C.K., London.

The Worcester "Liber Albus." By J. M.
Wilson, D.D. Pp. xix. 283.
Price, 15s. net. *St. Patrick :
his writings and life.* By N. J. D.
White, D.D. Pp. 142. Price,
6s. 6d. *Translations of Christian
Literature. Series I. Greek
Texts. Gregory Thaumaturgus ;
Address to Origen.* By W. Met-
calfe. Pp. 96. Price, 3s. 6d. n.

LONGMANS, London.

The Children's Bread. By Ws. Roche,
S.J. Pp. 96. Price, 2s. net.

SANDS & CO., London.

Twenty Cures at Lourdes. By Dr. de
Grandmaison de Bruno. Transla-
tion. Pp. xvii. 270. Price, 7s. n.
Vitalism and Scholasticism. By
Sir Bertram Windle. Pp. 259.
Blessed Oliver Plunkett. By a
Sister of Notre Dame. Pp. 203.
Price, 6s. net. *What Father
Cuthbert Knew.* By Grace Christ-
mas. Reprinted from "Catholic
Fireside." *Adventures Perilous*
(Story of F. John Gerard). By
E. M. Wilmot - Buxton. Pp.
xiii. 230. Price, 5s. net.

TÉQUI, Paris.

*Nos Tributs de Gloire. Retraite donnée
à Lourdes.* Pp. 299. Price, 3.50 fr.
Le bon esprit au collège. Ed. aug-
mentée. Pp. 278. Price, 3.50 fr.
Both by Mgr. Tissier, Evêque de
Chalons. *Dominicales Tom. II.
De la St. Joseph à la St. Pierre.*
3rd. Ed. By Abbé Eugène Du-
plessy. Pp. 493. Price, 5 fr. *Vers
la Victoire. Discours.* By Mgr.
E. L. Julien. Pp. 391. Price,
5 fr. *Retraite de premières retraites.*
By J. Millot, Vic.-gen. de Ver-
sailles. Pp. 310. Price, 5 fr.
*En marge des Combats N. D. de
Lourdes et la grande guerre.* By
Gabriel Joly. Pp. xii. 228. Price,
3.50 fr. *Un caractère (Le Cardinal
Mercier).* 2nd. Edition. By Eug.
Roupain, S.J. Pp. ix. 128. Price,
2 fr. *Carnet de Jeanne d'Arc.*
Notes. 2nd Edition. By E.
Roupain, S.J. Pp. 168. Price,
2.50 fr. *Admirable Histoire de
Joseph.* By Abbé F. Rouault.
Pp. 138. Price, 2 fr.

